

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO



3 1761 00888601 2

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2011 with funding from
University of Toronto

// A DISSERTATION
ON
THE VALIDITY //
OF
THE ORDINATIONS OF THE ENGLISH,
AND OF
THE SUCCESSION OF THE BISHOPS
OF
THE ANGLICAN CHURCH;
WITH
THE PROOFS ESTABLISHING THE FACTS
ADVANCED IN THIS WORK:

BY THE REV. FATHER
PIERRE FRANÇOIS LE COURAYER,
CANON REGULAR AND CHIEF LIBRARIAN
OF THE AUGUSTINIAN ABBEY OF ST. GENEVIÈVE AT PARIS.

THE OLD TRANSLATION OF MR. WILLIAMS COLLATED THROUGHOUT WITH THE
ORIGINAL, AND IN CONSEQUENCE ALMOST ENTIRELY RE-WRITTEN:
THE REFERENCES AND QUOTATIONS VERIFIED AND CORRECTED.

To which is added,

BESIDES MR. WILLIAMS'S PREFACE AND OTHER EDITORIAL MATTER,
WHICH IS ALL RETAINED,

I.—AN INTRODUCTION CONTAINING SOME ACCOUNT, AS WELL OF THE PRESENT AND
FORMER EDITIONS, AS OF THE AUTHOR HIMSELF, AND THE MEMO-
RABLE CONTROVERSIES TO WHICH THIS WORK GAVE RISE.

II.—A CONSIDERABLE BODY OF FURTHER NOTES.

III.—AN EPITOME OF THE WHOLE VOLUME.

Labor Improbus.

OXFORD,
JOHN HENRY PARKER:
RIVINGTONS, LONDON.

MDCCCLIV.

BX

5149

07 L4

OXFORD :
PRINTED BY I. SHRIMPTON.

THE EDITOR'S INTRODUCTION:

CONTAINING SOME ACCOUNT,

AS WELL OF

THE PRESENT AND FORMER EDITIONS,

AS OF

THE AUTHOR HIMSELF,

AND

THE MEMORABLE CONTROVERSIES

TO WHICH THE PRESENT WORK GAVE RISE.

THE fact that after an interval, apparently, of an hundred and sixteen years, a new Edition of the most celebrated Work yet published in defence of the validity of the Anglican Orders^a, has at length been loudly called for, is of itself both a safe indication of the great and favourable change which has taken place in the direction of English thought, and also a happy earnest of what, with the Divine blessing, may be hoped from the future. Under these circumstances, particularly, it was felt that all reasonable pains ought to be taken in editing so important a Work.

At first, indeed, it was naturally supposed that, with a letter so complimentary as that from the author to Mr. Williams (see p. 11—16), no better warrant could have been desired for reprinting that gentleman's translation as it stood; to have done which would of course have made the republication a comparatively easy task. This process, however, had scarcely commenced, when the present Editor, having occasion to consult the original, was surprised to find that it by no means corresponded so accurately as that letter seemed fairly to imply. Still it was hoped that,

^a On the Nag's-head Fable in particular, a Work intitled "The Story of the Ordination of our First Bishops in Queen Elizabeth's Reign at the Nag's-head

"Tavern in Cheapside thoroughly examined, &c.", by Thomas Browne, B.D. 1731, is the fullest examination of all the facts of the case.

without the labour and delay of a systematic collation, it might be sufficient to correct such material inaccuracies as might happen to be observed.

As the work, however, proceeded, the extreme faultiness of that translation became at length so apparent, as to make it impossible to doubt the absolute necessity of comparing it with the original throughout, and correcting it thereby ;—although it was not until this last business was fairly in hand, that the full truth appeared, how wretched beyond parallel (as one may reasonably hope) that translation was ; that in fact there were, comparatively speaking, but few sentences which did not require all but re-writing.

In short, to convey to the reader any tolerable idea of the translation, or rather, attempt at translation, in question, one can only compare it to the *exercise* of a beginner performed with no small haste and carelessness :—almost constantly aside of, it very frequently made important alterations in, occasionally even reversed, the meaning of the original ; and all this over and above so general an inaccuracy and awkwardness of expression, as to leave (when taken in connection with the above more serious faults) not merely few sentences, but comparatively few lines even, in which correction, more or less, was not required. In addition to all which, very considerable mutilations were also discovered.

Some occasional specimens of Mr. Williams's way of translating will be found in the Editor's Notes to the latter part of the Work : to have transcribed throughout even the worst specimens, would have been of itself no slight undertaking.

After the preceding account of that gentleman's translation, the reader may naturally wonder, that it was not at once discarded altogether, and a new one substituted in its place. In the way, however, of this, there was a material impediment, namely, that Mr. Williams had had communication with the author, and by his direction made certain alterations in the Work^b.

Had these alterations been formally enumerated, and the original of the substituted passages preserved, the whole might of course have been translated anew, making only the substitutions directed.

In the absence, however, of any such specification, Mr. Williams having unfortunately considered his translation “ sufficient for the English reader” (p. 10, l. 7), and been content with inserting in the Appendix the chief of the *rejected* passages, there was no alternative but to collate his translation throughout with the original French, and distinguish as well as might be, between mere blunders and such alterations as the author might possibly have directed himself. To do this was in general not difficult, the alterations being almost always such as it was quite impossible

^b See p. 10 A (i. e. p. 10, paragraph 1), with the Editor's Further Notes.

the author could have desired; but where there appeared a doubt, Mr. Williams's rendering has at least been given in the Notes.

It is stated, indeed, in the Life prefixed to the Socinian^c translation (London, 1787)^d of our author's Latest Opinions (see below),—a Life, however, which as respects the French part of his career is extremely incorrect^e,—

^c The word "Socinian" is employed here and elsewhere, in speaking of this translation and its author, as a popular term denoting the heresy which calls itself "Unitarian".

^d By Dr. Calder: see p. lxi, note u.

^e In the little that is said of that period of our author's life, the present Editor observes the following errors: 1. On p. xiii (the first of the Life itself), he is said to have been born Nov. 7, instead of 17. This mistake however is found in, and appears to have been taken from, D'Hebrail and Laporte's *La France Littéraire*, in 2 vols., 1769; the authority of which Work is expressly adduced on the same page for another mistake, concerning which see note s, p. xv. 2. On p. xv, he is stated to have been "considered as an avowed heretic on the publication" of his Dissertation in 1723, whereas he was not so considered till about four years after. 3. On p. xvi, Cardinal Tencin is mentioned with the Journalists of Trevoux, Gervaise, Hardouin, and Le Quien as of the number of the "learned men" who, "on the first appearance" of the Dissertation, presently entered the lists "to combat the new system".* What this Cardinal did and when, the reader will find in note i, p. xlv, and note y, p. xlix. 4. On p. xvi, xvii, the Defence of the Dissertation is said to have been published in 1725, instead of 1726. 5. On p. xvii, the Cardinal de Noailles, instead of the Cardinal de Bissy, is said to have "headed" the Prelates who formally condemned our author's Works. 6. On the same page it is implied that the Dissertation was formally condemned *before* the Defence, and consistently with this, the latter alone is mentioned as suppressed by the Decree of Council, Sept. 7. 1727. 7. On p. xviii, our author's Oxford D.D. degree is said to have been conferred *May*, instead of *August*, 28. 1727. † 8. On p. xxiii, the Abp of Paris is said to have "continued implacable", whereas it appears from our author's own account that the Abp was but forced by others into doing anything in the matter. ‡ Something more on this subject will be found in note i, p. xlv. 9. On

the same page the Marischal de Noailles, who endeavoured to arrange matters in a friendly way, is called "the Cardinal's brother", instead of his *nephew*; the brother too having been dead since Oct. 2. 1708. § 10. On the same page our author is represented as having set out for Calais "about a month after the date of his letter to the University of Oxford", i. e. after Dec. 1. 1727; whereas,—besides that what follows afterwards in the same paragraph, that after three days' delay at Calais, he reached England (it should rather have been *London*) "towards the end of January", shews sufficiently that, travelling in haste, he could not have set out sooner than *about six weeks* after the date mentioned,—we learn from his own statement (*Relation &c.* vol. 1, p. 311, 312), that he left Paris Jan. 12. 1728, and therefore that six weeks was in fact the precise period which intervened.

Such are the errors which the present Editor has observed in the nine short pages which this biographer has devoted at the beginning to the French part of our author's life! Farther on, but connected with the same period,—in that portion of the list of his Works which belongs to this time, the Dissertation is said (p. lxxv) to have been "first printed with the Approbation of the Licensor, that accompanies that Edition"; although this Approbation was purposely withheld at the time, and first published in the *Relation &c.* A.D. 1729: see note b, p. xvii. 2. In speaking of the unpleasant message which Bp Atterbury received from the French authorities on the occasion of our author's escape, this biographer has mistaken Cardinal Fleury (see p. xlvii) for the Cardinal de Noailles. 3. He misdates as made in England, an observation of our author's to Abp Wake, which was made more than two years sooner: see note h, p. xlv, xlvii. 4. He calls in question the fact of our author's actual excommunication, of which however the sentence itself is preserved in the *Relation &c.*: see p. l, note c.

Incorrect, however, as is this part of his work, the particulars which he has

* † ‡ § The substance, it should be observed, of these four mistakes is found in this biographer's chief authority, the *Anecdotes of Bowyer*, p. 84, 85; the second, however, being expressly corrected on p. 544. The other three are continued in the *Lit. Anecd.* also: see p. vii. note *.

that the present Work was reprinted in Holland in 1727; a statement which may be regarded as deriving some support,—as well from the fact (see p. xlv. with p. xlv. note *i*) of the suppression in France, by a Decree of Council dated the seventh of September the same year, of the present Work and its Defence (see p. xxxi, xxxii),—as also from the error of Nichols's Anecdotes of Bowyer (4to, 1782), p. 84, and (thence clearly derived, see p. vii. note *) of the London Biographical Dictionary of 1784 in 12, and 1798 in 15, volumes 8vo,—in which,—as in the Britannica and Perthensis Encyclopedias, the former of which certainly, and apparently the latter also^f, have simply transcribed the article of the Biog. Dict. of 1798,—the Work itself is said to have been published in Holland in 1727; an error of such magnitude^g, certainly, as that no one at all acquainted with and remembering the eventful history of our author's publications, and of the memorable controversies they occasioned, could otherwise have been guilty of it than by a mere *slip*, as it is called, *of the pen*; but which yet it may seem more easy to account for on the supposition of there having really been a reprint of that date, than on any other.

These two statements^h, then, may be allowed, notwithstanding their vagueness and difference (if not indeed the more on this very account),

collected of the subsequent half-century (all but three years) which our author spent in England, are both full and interesting, and may also, apparently, be better depended upon; and accordingly they have been made use of to a very considerable extent in the present Introduction; see pp. xlvi—lvii; into which indeed, omitting his Anti-Catholic and Socinian digressions, every thing that appeared of importance, or likely to interest the reader, has been transferred.

^f It begins at all events (as the Editor is informed) with the same words, makes the same statement with respect to the date of the present Work, and quotes the same passage from Jer. Markland (see p. li).

^g Great, however, as this error undoubtedly is, it is nevertheless rivalled not merely by the long string of blunders already given (see note *e*) from the Socinian biographer, but also by the following, which are found in the *Life* (signed "L—Y") given of our author in the *Biographie Universelle*;—in which, 1. Mason is made *Bishop* instead of *Archdeacon* of Norfolk, and Abp *Bramhall* converted into *Brucsal*. 2. Our author's letter of acceptance of the degree of D.D. conferred on him by the University of Oxford, is said

to be dated Dec. 1, 1732*, instead of 1727. 3. He is said to have had "a Canonry of Oxford" given him; and that too though it is said farther on that the English themselves do him the justice to record his adherence to the Church of Rome, as well as to his monastic profession, "and content themselves with saying 'that he approved their Liturgy in many respects, and had attended at their services'". 4. His *Derniers Sentiments* are stated to have been written in English by himself, instead of translated into English by a Socinian. This *Life* is nevertheless not without its value.

After the above, it may seem almost superfluous to add the following specimen of condensed popular biography:

"Although of the Catholic Church, he wrote zealously and ably in defence of the *Ordinances* of the Church of England; which Work was formally condemned by an Assembly of French *Cardinals* and *Archbishops*, and Courayer consequently left France for England." *Maunder's Biographical Treasury*, Ed. 4, London, 1842. With this passage compare the particulars to be given hereafter, p. xlv &c.

^h The author of the Socinian *Life*, it should be observed, professes, besides

* A guess-correction, possibly, of the transposition "1772", found in the Anecdotes of Bowyer, p. 84. Compare p. v, note †.

notwithstanding too the little authority (see note *e*) which belongs to the first, and the gross error involved in the second, to establish, when taken in connection with the above suppression, some considerable probability (to say the least) in favour of the existence of a Second Edition¹. But had this existence been ever so certain, unless it could have been shewn also that it was revised by the author himself, it would have been a fact of no

Works which the present Editor has seen*, to have derived much information (p. lxxix) from a "living" (p. v) friend of the author's, who, besides his own personal knowledge, referred also "to a publication in two volumes, small 8vo, 1777, by the Rev. W. Jones, B.A., then Rector of Pluckley in Kent, and afterwards of Paston in Northamptonshire, author of Physiological Disquisitions, &c. 1781, and other learned works", (now better known as "Jones of Nayland",) entitled "Observations in a Journey to Paris"; which in the new (Dr. Kippis's) *Biographia Britannica*†, as well as in Watts's *Bibliotheca Britannica*, is given more fully, and with a different date, "— to Paris by way of Flanders in the year 1776." These Observations, — to which also, and with the later date, the *Anecdotes of Bowyer* (see note *) refer (p. 85) as their principal authority, and to particular pages of which (always from the second volume) the new *Biog. Brit.* repeatedly appeals,—are unfortunately not reprinted in the Edition in 12 volumes 8vo of Mr. Jones's Works; nor has the present Editor been able to obtain a sight of them; but it is rather remark-

able that the *Allgemeine Encyclopædie* of Leipsic 1818 also refers in its list of authorities to the same Work under a German title, and as published at Leipsic with the earlier date,—"*Angestellte Beobachtungen auf einer Reise nach Paris durch Flandern, Leipz. 1776.*" ("Arranged Observations in a Journey to Paris through Flanders, Leipsic, 1776.") The author of the same Life adds (p. lxxix, lxxx) that the account of our author contained in this publication "was communicated" "by James Smyth Esq. of Upper Grosvenor Street." The same statement is made in the *Anecdotes of Bowyer* (see note *).—Considering, however, the extreme incorrectness (see note *e*) of the Socinian biographer's account of the French part of our author's life, it may well be questioned whether, after all, his statement at least, about the *re*-print in 1727 is not a mere guess-correction of the error of the *Anecdotes of Bowyer*, to which he professes (see note *) to be principally indebted.

¹ If there was in reality no Second Edition of the original, the Second Edition of Mr. Williams's translation may possibly have contributed to give rise to the mistake.

* "All the information contained in the *Nouveau Dict. Hist.*, 8vo. 6 tomes, 1779, under the Art. *Courayer*, has been introduced into this narrative. The 'Biographical Dictionary', in 12 vols. 8vo, 1784, furnished some materials; and so did 'Atterbury's Epistolary Correspondence, &c. with his torical notes', vol. iv, 8vo, 1787. But much the best part of the account has been procured from 'the 'Anecdotes of Bowyer', 1782, a book replete with biographical knowledge, and curious particulars of literary history." P. vi. (See also note †.)—N.B. 1. The *Anecdotes of Bowyer* (one 4to volume) were afterwards incorporated by their author (John Nichols, F.S.A.) into his *Literary Anecdotes of the Eighteenth Century*, in nine volumes, 8vo, 1812—1816. Bowyer was a learned printer of the last century, whose apprentice, and subsequently partner, Nichols was. Nichols was also the Editor of *Atterbury's Epistolary Correspondence*, mentioned above, and author of the *Illustrations* (see p. lvii) of the *Literary History of the Eighteenth Century*, in 6 volumes, 8vo, 1817—1831, (of which however the two last, published in 1828 and 1831, were posthumous,) and numerous other Works.—2. The *London Biog. Dict.* of 1784, of which, in addition to the *Anecdotes of Bowyer*, the Socinian biographer speaks as having "furnished some materials", neither refers to any other authority nor contains any other matter than what is found in the *Anecdotes*.—3. Of the *Nouveau Dictionnaire Historique* the present Editor has seen only the Edition of 1786.

† Of which the volume containing the Art. *Courayer* is dated 1789. The Editor (a Dissenting Minister) having died in 1795, this Edition was broken off in the letter F.—Of the life of our author contained in this Work the Socinian biographer speaks beforehand as written "by a biographer whose name is next to Dr. Kippis's", and as obligingly communicated, still in an unfinished state by its author to himself, though "it came too late to have enabled him to refer to it with propriety, and to save him the trouble of drawing up the rough sketch which is here exhibited, with all its imperfections on its head." P. vii. He however prefixes, with that author's consent, two passages (occupying pp. ix—xii), taken from a translated quotation from the first volume of our author's *Relation &c.* (see p. viii of this *Introd.*), expressing his sentiments concerning the duty of seriousness in religion (p. 431), and the peculiar excellence of the gospel (p. 431—433). In return the *finished* article in the new *Biog. Brit.* makes considerable use of the Socinian biographer's account.

real consequence to our present purpose ;—whereas if this second fact of the revision could have been satisfactorily proved, and a copy of such revised Edition procured, the use of Mr. Williams's translation (except perhaps as an historical record of such alterations as he expressly asserts to have been made according to the author's direction) might certainly have been dispensed with altogether. As yet, however, not only has the present Editor been unable, after the most diligent inquiry and search, either to meet with or hear of any such copy, but also the balance of presumptions, so far as he has himself been able to examine into the question, inclines him altogether to the belief, that if any such reprint was made, at least no such revision by the author ever took place.

On this head, in the absence of direct evidence on the subject, it may be sufficient to observe, that against the probability of a revised Edition, the single fact, that besides the original of 1723, no French Edition at all is to be found in any Library in Oxford,—to say nothing here of other Libraries,—must be allowed, considering the great attention which both the author and his Works had attracted, to be of itself no slight presumption. But besides this,—and without resting, too, on the fact that no such Second Edition is mentioned by Mr. Williams in the title-page or Advertisement of the Second Edition of his own English translation, published (as the reader will see) in 1728^j,—what seems decisive is, that the author writing in 1729, in his Historical and Apologetic Relation of his Opinions and Conduct, published at Amsterdam, though anxious to disclaim, and to shew how fully he had disclaimed from the first, the adoption of a view of Thorndike's, which from his observations in the present Work some had inferred that he did adopt,—when detailing the steps he had taken to correct and prevent this mistake, mentions amongst others the alterations he had directed to be made in the English translation, but takes no notice whatever of any fresh Edition at all of the French original. (Vol. 1, p. 15, 16.)

This one fact, though but negative evidence, might well have been deemed a sufficient ground for dismissing the question ; but in order that nothing might be wanting on the Editor's part, he has also, as already stated, made extensive search and inquiry after the alleged Edition, or any satisfactory information concerning it. The result has been given above.

^j Mr. Williams's First Edition was published at London in 1725.—Lowndes's Bibliographer's Manual mentions also,—and a letter from an Irish Clergyman to the present Editor, dated Oct. 15. 1842, refers expressly to,—a Dublin Edition of the same year: it is not improbable, how-

ever, that the same Edition may have had a different title-page, according as it was intended for English or for Irish sale ; the less because the pages to which this Clergyman refers (28, 29, and 36) agree with those of the London Edition.

But although it appeared sufficiently certain that no Second Edition corrected by the author himself had ever been published, it was by no means improbable that he might have made manuscript corrections with a view to such an Edition, whensoever it might be called for. And as he had given his books to the Library of St. Martin's Parish in London (Archbishop Tennyson's Library), it seemed not unlikely that either a copy of the First Edition so corrected, or, if there really was any Second corrected Edition, that Edition itself, might be found there.

A friend, however, who did the Editor the kindness to visit that Library for the purpose of ascertaining the truth in this respect, reports that no other Edition besides the original one of 1723 is to be found there, and that,—although in the copy there preserved of the Defence of the present Work (see p. xxxi, xxxii) there are some manuscript additions and notes, together with one correction, of value,^k (which he also kindly transcribed and sent him, and which should be appended to any future Edition of that Work,^l)—he does not observe any such additions or corrections in the copy of the present Work. There may, however, have been some amongst our author's MS. papers; but of these, according to the Librarian's account, there are none preserved there.

To return, however, to Mr. Williams's translation, the collation and examination which the present Editor has been obliged to go through has fully satisfied him that there is no sufficient reason for believing that Mr. Williams had authority for any other alterations than those for which he himself expressly pleads such authority. Could this have been known from the first, much labour and doubt would have been spared,—the more because the Editor was unable to procure a copy of Mr. Williams's Second Edition to prepare for the press, so that up to p. 116 (if he remembers rightly) it appeared necessary to collate that gentleman's two Editions together. After the collation of that portion it became abundantly obvious, that it was quite sufficient to collate Mr. Williams's First Edition with the French alone, and merely examine the notes of his Second.

At first indeed the Editor had been desirous to retain as much as possible of Mr. Williams's language, and therefore of course of that of the Second Edition: in the case however of such a translation as that under consideration, this could be of no real consequence; much less of such consequence

^k On a second visit, which he had the kindness to make, he saw that the Supplement to the present Work and its Defence (see p. xli) had also a MS. addition at the end; which, however, want of time on that occasion, and subsequently his finding the Librarian "not in", with other circumstances, prevented his copying;—as they

did also his examining again, and with greater care, the Dissertation itself. (*See the result of a visit by the Editor himself, in the Additional Notes to this Introduction.*)

^l In the mean time the Editor has thought it best to preserve them at the end of the present Introduction.

as to make it in any sense worth while to continue, for this purpose alone, to compare these two Editions together ; particularly when the difference between them was observed to be very little.

In fact the reader must understand, that,—notwithstanding Mr. Williams's profession in the Advertisement to his Second Edition, of having therein restored the mutilations, and otherwise corrected the faults, of the First,—the difference between the two, if it may be regarded as in some degree considerable in itself, is yet very trifling when compared with the faults and mutilations which remain uncorrected, in the Second as in the First Edition.

It must not, however, be supposed that the faults of either of Mr. Williams's Editions are of such a nature as to admit of being excused by the plea of any possible negligence in printing from, or any supposable dishonesty in altering, his manuscript; one or both of which excuses may seem to be implied in his own Advertisement to the Second Edition (see p. 2), and is at all events distinctly advanced in his favour by our author, in the Preface and Appendix to his Defence of the present Work ; in the latter of which places, in the introductory paragraph prefixed to a reprint of his complimentary letter itself, he says : “ I did not foresee then, any more than Mr. Williams, that some places would be altered in the impression, as it has turned out,” (vol. IV. p. ccxxix.) ; in the former, still more pointedly, as follows : “ I did not foresee that in the impression his manuscript would be mutilated contrary to his intention, and he must have been as much surprised as myself at the unfaithfulness towards him with which it had been used. This information is necessary for those who, not being able to reconcile the eulogium of this translation with some unfaithfulnesses which appear in it, might perhaps endeavour again to tire the public with reflections equally false and odious”. (Vol. I. p. xxiv.)

If indeed it could be supposed that the printer, having lost Mr. Williams's manuscript, employed a school-boy to re-translate the Work, or with any sinister object substituted such a translation for that gentleman's own, and if the Second Edition were found correct, then indeed might that gentleman be held blameless. But besides the utter improbability of such a supposition as this, Mr. Williams himself gives no hint of any such thing, but speaks only of the mutilation (whether by himself or by others he does not say) of certain passages ; whereas the real fault complained of is, that few sentences, even, stand as they should.

And in fact to what purpose were it, ever so well to excuse the faults of the First Edition, when the Second, which Mr. Williams himself distinctly professes to have corrected and cleared from those faults, differs so little from the First, that a description of the one is to all practical intents and purposes a description of the other ?

“ Quid te exempta juvat spinis de pluribus una ? ”

Of many thorns, what helps thee one drawn out ?

HOR. EP. II. ii. 212.

The truth is, it is hopeless to say more in excuse for such a translation, than that its author had altogether mistaken the amount of his acquaintance with the French language, and having the habit (as one must needs suppose) of aiming at speed rather than accuracy, thought it necessary, on account of the great importance of the Work he was translating, to advance at a still greater rate ; the consequence being, that even what knowledge he had of French was but partially brought to bear on his work.

As for the mutilations, some, of course, may have been the printer's fault ; but it must be borne in mind that Mr. Williams himself does not assert any such thing, but merely states the fact of their existence, observing that it was useless “ to examine how these things happened ” ; and if we consider the haste and carelessness observable throughout his whole translation, it will seem far more probable that the greater part at least are his own. At all events the largest omission of all, that of the whole third Article of the Appendix (see p. 311),—consisting of the Edwardine Form of Ordering Priests and Bishops, with three introductory paragraphs,—was made by himself, and that designedly, as he himself tells us ; *the truth being, that, for want of reading or attending to the first of these same introductory paragraphs, he mistook the Ordination Service of King Edward VI. for that of the present Anglican Prayer-book, and so thought it useless to re-print it !* Even this mutilation was not corrected in the Second Edition, the only improvement being a verbal alteration in the notice substituted for the omitted Article !

The fact however appears to be, that as in the First Edition Mr. Williams translated too rapidly either to apply what knowledge he had of French, or to avoid otherwise mistaking and mutilating his author, so in the Second, notwithstanding the serious mistakes he confesses himself to have discovered in the First, he never thought it necessary to be at the trouble of collating the whole again with the original, but merely corrected such faults as he had happened to observe himself, or had had pointed out to him by others.

Having said so much of the faults of both Mr. Williams's Editions, it is but just to add that with *the subject* of the present Work he was by no means unacquainted, as may be gathered partly from his Editions themselves, and still more from his having previously (in 1721) been the author of an 8vo volume on the Anglican Succession : see p. 5 and the Further Notes. With respect, however, to the particular merits of that Work, the present Editor is unable to speak.

As for Courayer's own complimentary Letter, it is probable he was not a very perfect English scholar at the time he wrote it, and that the specimen he had read (he had only seen "some sheets in manuscript"^m) having appeared to express sufficiently his general meaning, he never took the precaution to collate any part of it with the original. Something too may be fairly allowed, according to Mr. Williams's own expression in modestly disclaiming (see the last sentence of p. 9) the compliments passed by our author on his supposed, or rather presumed, style (compare the end of the Letter with the beginning), for "the custom and way of speaking and writing in this complaisant country."

To return, however, to the present Edition,—the references have been verified wherever possible, and the quoted passages collated and corrected, either in the text or in the notes; by which means it has been rendered considerably more accurate than even the original French Edition.

Another material improvement is the rendering into English, either in the text within brackets, or in the notes, all the Latin and other quotations not before translated. Mr. Williams indeed (see the last paragraph of his Preface, p. 10) professed to translate in the text such passages as appeared to him to require it, and throw the originals to the bottom of the page; but even supposing him to have taken pains at first in considering which passages needed to be translated, and which might be left as they were,—in the latter part, at all events, of the Work, he has left them almost all untouched. Even had this not been the case, the course most satisfactory to the general reader was undoubtedly to translate the whole.

More important additions are,

1. The running titles at the tops and sides of the pages, which it has cost some trouble to construct, but which it is hoped will be a considerable assistance to the reader. Neither in the original nor in either of Mr. Williams's Editions is there any other running title than the general title of the Work, nor can even the Chapter be ascertained without turning backwards and forwards, or referring to the Table of Contents, (see p. xiii). The side references however on pages 18 and 25, and the side-notes in italics on pages 39 and 41, all which it would have been better for the sake of distinction to have placed at the foot of the page, are Courayer's own: for every thing else at the side, the present Editor alone is responsible; the use of brackets *there* being merely to distinguish simple references from running titles. In another Edition running titles should be added at the side of the author's Preface and of the Mémoire of Renaudot:—with respect to the preceding sixteen pages see p. xiii, xiv.

2. Very considerable insertions within brackets in the foot-notes, to-

^m Preface to the Defence of the present Work, vol. 1, p. xxiii.

gether with some (besides the above translations of quotations) in the text itself. It must be understood, however, that such insertions within brackets as are marked with an obelisk (†) at the beginning are Mr. Williams's, as are also all those, whether within brackets or not, which have his initials (D. W.) at the end, or are noted by the Editor as not being in the French Edition. For every thing else which is inclosed within brackets,—except the insertion in the *Mémoire* of Renaudot, p. 25, which is Courayer's own, and any thing which may be distinctly pointed out in the notes as his,—the present Editor alone is responsible.

3. A considerable body of *Further Notes by the Editor*, consisting chiefly of explanatory and illustrative observations, facts, and quotations, applying to the whole Work; in which also a good many inaccuracies in the matter of the Work itself have been noticed. They must be regarded, however, not as the result of systematic research, but rather as a collection of passing remarks;—in which, accordingly, the reader is requested to correct and excuse the imperfections and errors he will doubtless too often have occasion to observe.

4. An Epitome of the whole volume, which may assist considerably in giving the reader a general view of the line of argument adopted by the author, as well as in remembering and referring to both the Work itself and its accompaniments. In this Epitome is included the old Table of Contents, or List of the Headings of the Chapters of the Text and Articles of the Appendix.

It had been the Editor's intention to add some additional Indices; but, besides that time forbids, an Epitome such as that now given, embracing as it does, not merely an analysis of the whole argument, but also systematic mention of the more remarkable authors cited, and persons and things noticed by the way, will be found an almost equally convenient and far more useful substitute.

As for Mr. Williams'sⁿ Index, or Apology for an Index, it has been given entire, but with some considerable explanatory insertions and notes (within brackets), in its old place at the end of the Appendix. An Index of any kind can hardly fail of being useful; but Mr. Williams's has a further merit, less commonly found in Indices, that of being entertaining also, particularly in the way in which the things to be noted are reduced into alphabetical order.

Another very considerable addition is the present Introduction itself; which, although in some parts, especially in those which relate to Mr. Williams's translation, and the course which the present Editor has been obliged to pursue with respect to it, it has been swelled by circumstances to a greater length than he could have wished, will not, he hopes, be found

ⁿ In the Bodleian copy this Index is wanting, but there can be no reasonable doubt that it is Mr. Williams's.

useless, or altogether devoid of interest, even to the general reader. As to what concerns that translation, besides that the considerations already mentioned make it of some importance to the text of the original Work, it is in itself a sufficiently curious fact in the annals of book-making to deserve some notice on its own account.

Considering however what it has turned out to be, it would seem better in another Edition, 1. to dismiss to the Appendix, and there print in smaller type, the whole of the sheet of sixteen pages now containing its constructor's Title-page, Dedication, Advertisement, and Preface, together with our author's complimentary Letter to him, and the English translation of that Letter; 2. to restore to the text the Latin quotations removed by Mr. Williams to the bottom of the page, retaining however within brackets, as in the case of the quotations now first translated, the corrected translations; and 3. in those places where Mr. Williams claims authority from Courayer himself for making alterations,—after adopting, as in the present Edition, all such of his differences from the original as are not obviously, or in all reasonable probability, the mere result of his general carelessness and incompetency for his work, and preserving, as now, the remainder in the Notes (see the next paragraph),—to add the French of the author's own original Edition, not in the Appendix, as Mr. Williams has done, but at the foot of the page.

The Editor's Further Notes, too, in any future Edition would obviously be better placed with the rest, immediately under the text. For the present Edition,—besides a doubt which some formerly^o entertained, how far notes were admissible in the publications of the Anglo-Catholic Library (for which, the public need hardly be told, this Edition was originally undertaken),—they could not conveniently be got ready in time.

And here, as, in consequence of the brevity of the public notice on the subject, there appears to have been some misapprehension with respect to the grounds of the withdrawal of this Work from the list of the above Library, it will not be improper to state distinctly that the arrangement to that effect between the Managers of the Library and the Editor of the present volume was entirely of an amicable nature, arising partly from the wish not to injure the usefulness of the Edition by separating the notes from the text, while yet it was then^p thought doubtful (as has just been intimated) to what extent notes were admissible in the publications of the Library,—partly from a further doubt whether the Work of a Roman Catholic was strictly within the design of the Society,—and partly

^o Since the publication of Bramhall's *Consecration of Protestant Bishops*, with the copious and invaluable notes of the Editor (the Rev. A. W. Haddan, M.A.,

Fellow and Tutor of Trin. Coll., Oxford), all remaining doubt on this head must of course have completely vanished.

^p See note *o*.

from its appearing otherwise more convenient to both parties. Had this not been the case, the Editor would of course have followed the instructions of the Managers, and contented himself with the liberty of publishing in a separate form (if it appeared advisable) what seemed inconsistent with the plan of the Library. It may be observed, however, that a notion appears to have been entertained, that the notes in question were both more extensive, and also of a more *theological* character, than in point of fact they will be found to be. The former of these ideas was probably a mistaken inference from the fact of the Editor's having contemplated a separate publication.

It remains only (as respects the present Edition) to acknowledge the very material assistance which in various ways the ready kindness as well of official persons as of personal friends has afforded him. In particular he desires to thank publicly the Rev. B. Bandinel, D.D., Keeper of the Bodleian, and the Under-Librarians:—with respect to the obligations under which others have laid him, he does not feel equally at liberty.

Having explained sufficiently what relates to the present and preceding English Editions, the Editor proceeds naturally to give some account of the Work itself and its author, together with the memorable controversies to which it gave rise.

Pierre François Le Courayer “was born”, says the *Allgemeine Encyclopædie* of Leipsic, 1818, “at Rouen^a in Normandy, where his father was “President of the Court of Justice, Nov. 17^r, 1681; received his first “scientific instruction at Vernon; came in his 14th year to the College of “Beauvais at Paris; and in the same place entered two years later the “Congregation of St. Geneviève. There he honourably distinguished “himself by his talents and scientific efforts, so that in 1706 he was “appointed Presbyter of his Congregation, and also Professor of Theo- “logy. After he had performed the duties of this Office up to Aug. “1711, the oversight of the rich Library of the Abbey was given into his “hands.”^s

While holding this situation and before his more public career he was

^a The Anecdotes of Bowyer say *Vernon*, both here (p. 84) and in mentioning his Will (p. 85). See more p. lv.

^r In the *La France Littéraire* of D' Hebraïl and Laporte (in two volumes, 1769), vol. 1, p. 229, the date is given as Nov. 7, a mistake which has been followed by the Socinian biographer (p. xiii, the first of the Life itself: compare note *e*), notwithstanding the inscription mentioned by himself on p. lxxx (see p. lv of this In-

trod.); to which may be added the decisive authority of that under the picture in the Bodleian (see p. lvii, and compare p. lv. note *u*).

^s The new Biog. Brit. (see p. vii, note †) refers to vol. 2, p. 19 of the “Observations “in a Journey &c.” (see p. vii, note *h*) for a description of this Library;—which “is a “grand room in the form of a cross, about “300 feet in length and breadth, with a “dome finely painted in the center”.

the author, according to *Quérard's* "La France Littéraire"^t, of "A Letter to M. l'Abbé *** (Girardin [compare p. xlv]^u) concerning a new project of a Library Catalogue, dated 1712. In folio, consisting of 8 two-column pages." Also, according to the *Biographie Universelle* and the same authority, of a *Mémoire* concerning the life of Father Le Bossu^x, at the head of the Sixth Edition, published by himself, of that Father's Treatise on the Epic Poem; The Hague, 1714, in 12mo.^y Also, according to the same authorities, of Letters on his theological contests and *Mémoires* in the *L'Europe Sçavante*, to which *Quérard* adds the date "1718—20";—about which same time may perhaps have been written the Treatises on the superiority of Bishops as compared with Priests, and on the Supremacy of the Pope, which the same authorities attribute to him, but which, they say, appear not to have been printed.—He was also, as the same authorities again inform us, the Editor of a Collection of Spiritual Letters on various subjects of morality and piety, by Father Quesnel: Paris, Barrois, 1721, 3 volumes 12mo.

Though far from being a Jansenist,—being on the contrary decidedly opposed to their views,—he was yet among the Appellants against the celebrated Constitution (or Bull) *Unigenitus*, of the date of Sep. 8. 1713,^z by which they were finally condemned, a circumstance to which he mainly attributes the determined opposition he subsequently experienced from the maintainers of that Constitution^a,—an opposition which was

^t In ten volumes, 1827—1839. The volume containing the Life of Le Courayer was published in 1833.

^u Patrick Piers De Girardin, Doctor of the Sorbonne: compare p. 336 of the present Work. "His name was originally *Piers* only, but he added *De Girardin* to denote his extraction from a family of that name in Ireland. From the information of Father Courayer."—*Note in the old Biog. Brit., Art. WAKE*, p. 4090: compare p. xvii note c.

^x Like himself, a Canon Regular of St. Geneviève.

^y The Treatise, or such a Treatise, itself, is erroneously ascribed to him in the *La France Littéraire* of the Abbés D' Hebrail and Laporte*, vol. 1, p. 229; a mistake which the Socinian biographer (compare p. lxxv with p. xiii, xiv) adopts on the authority (which however he expressly adduces) of that publication; the new *Biog. Brit.* (see p. vii, notes *h* and *†*) on the authority of the Socinian biographer; and the new *Biog.*

Dict. (see p. vi, and p. vii note *) on the authority of the *Biog. Brit.*—In the *Nouveau Dict. Hist.* of 1786 (the Editor has not seen that of 1779) the matter is stated correctly.

^z In the *Encyclopædia Britannica* this Bull, being confounded with the Bull *Vineam Domini Sabaoth*, is mis-dated July 17. 1705; the real date however of this earlier Bull being neither July 17, nor, as the *Encyclopédie Méthodique* has it, July 15), but '17 Cal. Aug.', i. e. July 16.—In the Bull *Unigenitus* were condemned 101 (not, as the latter *Encyclopædia* gives it in one place, i. e. in the Article "Constitution", an hundred and ten) propositions of Quesnel's *New Testament* or *Reflexions Morales* &c.

^a Called *Constitutionaries*, as the opposite party *Anti-Constitutionaries*. To these latter the Abp of Paris himself, the celebrated Cardinal de Noailles, belonged for more than fourteen years, although eventually, Oct. 11. 1728[†], he subscribed the Bull.—In an Assembly of 49 Bishops, over

* In two volumes, 1769. To this Work Laporte added two supplementary volumes of inferior value in 1778, and the Abbé Guiot, two more "below criticism" in 1784. *Quérard's new "La France Littéraire"* (see note *r*): *Disc. Prelim.*: vol. 1, p. xiv.

[†] In the life of Quesnel (signed "L—Y": compare p. vi, note *g*) in the *Biog. Univ.* this date is given or printed wrongly as 1718.

all the more severe from his having even the Jansenists themselves against him.

At the time, however, of the publication of the present Work (see p. xviii), he was still a Regular Canon or Monk, and chief Librarian, of the Augustinian Abbey of St. Geneviève at Paris. His motives and object in writing on the subject, together with the history of the composition of the Work itself, are sufficiently stated in his own Preface; in which, however, the circumstances which delayed its publication for two years are purposely passed over in silence. A full account of these will be found in the first Chapter of his Historical and Apologetic Relation of his Opinions and Conduct, published at Amsterdam in 1729 in two volumes 12mo; from which it appears that the delay was owing to the determined efforts of those who wished the book suppressed, and who, notwithstanding its having received, on the 1st of Oct. 1721, not merely the Approbation, but also the high praise, of the Censor (M. D'Arnaudin),^b whom he had politely been allowed to choose, succeeded in preventing the usual Privilege from being granted. These efforts, however, served only to perfect and improve the Work, especially by means of a correspondence into which its author entered with Archbishop Wake, by whom he was most kindly furnished with much original matter of importance.^c

which he presided himself, held Jan. 25. 1714, forty had accepted the Bull: the remaining nine, including himself, thought proper to wait for explanations; one however of their number, M. de Clermont, Bp of Laon, adding himself afterwards to the majority.—*Biographie Universelle*.

^b This Approbation, having been withheld at the time,—“in order not to com- mit without necessity the Approver,”—was afterwards published in the second or documentary volume of the Relation, of which, with an introductory paragraph, it forms the first Article, p. 1—3.

^c Our author was encouraged to apply to the Abp by the correspondence which had taken place a little earlier (1717—1720) between that Prelate and Dr Dupin of the Sorbonne, concerning a projected union of the Anglican and Gallican Churches; a good deal of which, after an account of the whole affair, is given by Maclaine at the end of his Translation of Mosheim's Eccl. Hist., Appendix III, p. 146—168 Ed. 1768*: see also the old

Biog. Brit., Art. *Wake*. Of the eighteen letters or extracts of letters given by Maclaine, three are in Latin, *viz.* two to Dr Dupin himself and one to Dr Girardin †, the rest in English, *viz.* one from Mr Beauvoir, Chaplain to the Earl of Stair, British Ambassador at Paris, to the Abp, and the remainder from the Abp to Mr Beauvoir. ‡

The Latin letter, dated July 23. 1721, by which our author first applied to the Abp, is preserved in the above article. The Abp replied in two (or two parts of one) Latin, and a number of English letters; and continued for many years (or rather, perhaps, during life) a regular correspondence with our author. At all events, the author of the above article, writing in 1763 (see p. 4095), says: “A series of no less than five and “forty letters in MS. now lies before me, “from Sep. 1721 to Jan. 1728, written by “the Abp. They were communicated by “Father Courayer;” &c. &c. Of some of the English letters copious and interesting extracts are given, together with a few annotations; in one of which (p. 4092) we

* Volumes 1 and 3 are misdated 1758. The account occupies pp. 117—145.

† Also a Doctor of the Sorbonne: see note *u*, p. xvi.

‡ As a PS. to one of these last letters (to Mr B.), dated Dec. 2. 1718, the Abp writes (p. 160): “Did Cardinal de Noailles know what authority the Abp of Canterbury has got by the Reformation, “and how much a greater man he is now than when he was the Pope's *Legatus Natus*, it might en- courage him to follow so good a pattern; and be assured (in that case) he would lose nothing by “sending back his Cardinal's cap to Rome. I doubt your Doctors know little of these matters.”

At length, some of his friends, having taken a copy of his manuscript, put it to press without his knowing it at the time, or indeed long before the public. In consequence, however, the Work was published, as we learn from the Relation (vol. 1, Chap. 1, p. 9), in the latter part^d of 1723. It was printed at Nanci in France, or rather in the Duchy of Lorraine then of late attached to France, on the strength of the Approbation of the Censor, and of "the tacit permission of the Magistrate", but as it had never received the Privilege, the bookseller thought it safest to name only a Brussels publisher, and so conceal the fact of its having been printed within the French Dominions^e.

The title-page of the original (which was in two parts or volumes 12mo) was: "Dissertation sur la Validité des Ordinations des Anglois, et sur la Succession des Evesques de l'Eglise Anglicane, avec les Preuves Justificatives des faits avancez dans cet Ouvrage. Première (or Seconde)

are informed that the Latin letters, of which our author has reprinted so much at the end of the present Work (p. 346—364), "fill no less than twelve sheets of paper, "close written on all sides"; the date (i. e. of the first*) being "xv. Cal. Oct.", i. e. Sep. 17, "A. D. M. DCC. XXI."—Concerning the later English letters, see note *h*, p. xlv.

Of this, as well as the preceding correspondence, the Anecdotes of Bowyer (4to 1782) say: "The original papers which the Abp sent over to Courayer, together with several letters which passed concerning the terms of a projected reconciliation between the Churches of France and England, are now in † the possession of the Rev. Osmund Beauvoir, Master of the King's School at Canterbury, whose father was Chaplain to the British Embassy, and through his hands the "correspondence with Abp Wake was "carried on." P. 84. That Dr Osmund Beauvoir should be in possession of the letters concerning the projected union addressed by the Abp to his father, is both very natural, and is also stated as a fact, as well by the author of the above article, (see p. 4090), as by Maclaine, to whom he furnished copies (p. 120) ‡;—but how he came by those which had but passed through his father's hands to Courayer, and which, as we have seen above, had in 1763 been communicated by Courayer himself to the writer of the above article, we are not informed.

^d In the French, "à la fin"; but that

* Of the second the Abp himself says in a letter of Dec. 9. 1721: "With this you will receive my Latin letter in answer to your last enquiries". *Ibid.* p. 4093. In the same letter he speaks of "the two sheets sent him" of the present Work.

† In the Lit. Anecd. (see p. vii. note *), vol. 2, p. 40, we have (A.D. 1812) "were in".

‡ Maclaine had also copies of letters from Wake's MSS. at Christ Church, Oxford.—*Ibid.*

this must be so understood, is clear from the dates of some of the notices and complimentary letters just about to be mentioned in the text, especially the letter of Oct. 15. 1723, the writer of which says expressly, "I waited for the publication of your Work to make myself master of the "question you examine." Another of these letters is dated, as the reader will see, Oct. 10. 1723; and in that of Nov. 5. 1723 its writer says that he read the Work with delight *directly it had appeared*. To which letters,—to the disparaging announcement in the Journal de Trevoux of November 1723 (see p. xx), and to the highly favourable notice in the Nouvelles Littéraires for the next month, testifying at the same time to a similar reception from both French and English readers (see p. xix),—may be added the letter of Tournemine the Jesuit to our author, dated Oct. 7. 1723, —which with an introductory paragraph forms the 7th Article (p. 68, 69) of the second or documentary volume of the Relation, and in which the writer, besides expressing his own favourable opinion of the Anglican Ordinations, states that persons of ability had spoken highly of the present Work, and inquires where he can buy it.

^e In the Defence (the Editor has forgotten where) he speaks of it as printed *outside the Kingdom*, "hors du Royaume". So also in his letter to Cardinal Fleury, preserved in the Relation, vol. 2, p. 172; and in a note to p. 327 of the same volume.

“Partie. A Bruxelles, chez Simon t’ Serstevens, Libraire, près les RR. “PP. Dominicains. M.DCCXXIII.” *A Dissertation^f on the Validity of the Ordinations of the English, and on the Succession of the Bishops of the Anglican Church, with the Proofs establishing the facts advanced in this Work. First (or Second) Part^g. Brussels^h: Simon t’ Serstevens, Bookseller, near the Reverend Fathers the Dominicans. MDCCXXIII.*

Its first reception appears to have been very favourable, and the interest it excited very considerable. Our author tells us (Rel. vol. 1, Chap. 1, p. 12—14) he received a great number of complimentary letters on the occasion, of which he contents himself with giving specimens of four, of the dates of Oct. 10 and 15 and Nov. 5, 1723, and March 10, 1724. He adds (p. 14) that in letters not addressed to himself the Work was similarly spoken of, instancing particularly one to the Prior of St. Geneviève, of which copious extracts will be found farther on, and one of M. l’Abbé Caldaguez, concerning which see p. xxxv.

As to public testimonies, those of the *Nouvelles Littéraires* and of the *Journal des Sçavans* are mentioned in Mr. Williams’s Preface, p. 6 C (i. e. p. 6, paragraph 3); more fully noticed in our author’s own “*Relation &c.*”, vol. 1, Chap. 1, p. 11, 12, and vol. 2, Art. 3 (see p. xx);—in the former of which places (p. 11) we have an extract from the first mentioned periodical, whose Editor, Father Des-Molets, in the No. for Dec. 1723, p. 34, 35ⁱ, testifies as follows to the high sense which himself and, as he asserts, persons in general entertained of it:

“ ‘This Dissertation’, says the Author of these *Nouvelles*, ‘is well
“ ‘written and very methodical; the judgment of the author shines in the
“ ‘choice of the proofs and the force of his reasonings; his criticism is sound
“ ‘and judicious; and he shews throughout a great knowledge of theology.
“ ‘This book has been equally well received by the English and the French.
“ ‘. . . This Dissertation is from a master hand. He follows his adversary
“ ‘foot to foot, and overwhelms him by the force of his reasons, which he
“ ‘pushes to demonstration.’” P. 11.

The *Extrait*^k or *Extraits* in the *Journal des Sçavans* appeared in the Nos. for Jan. and Feb. 1724. After the first portion the Editor (M. l’Abbé Des-Fontaines) wrote to our author to ask his consent to his naming him in the second, which he was about to publish. To this our author readily consented, availing himself, however, of the same opportunity, as well to disavow the system of Thorndike, which it was alleged he had adopted, (compare p. viii,) as to notice some observations of the Journalist which appeared

^f See Mr Williams’s Preface. p. 10, l. 9.

^g Or *Volume*. See p. 201.

^h See the preceding page.

ⁱ As cited by our author.

^k By “*Extrait*” is meant an account of

a new Work,—fuller than what we call a “*Notice*”, and keeping more nearly to the ostensible object than what we call a “*Review*”,—into which portions of the Work itself are extracted or abstracted.

to him not sufficiently exact;—which he did in two letters dated Jan. 12 and Feb. 5. 1724, and inserted in the April (in the Holland Edition, the May) No. next following. Of these letters reprinted, together with an introductory paragraph, consists the 3d Article (p. 24—35) of the second or documentary volume of the Relation; the first letter beginning on p. 25, the second on p. 30.

As however might naturally be expected, all the world were not of one mind on the subject. The favourable *Extrait* in the Journal des Sçavans drew down upon its author a severe reprimand from Cardinal Fleury, “then late Bishop of Frejus” (Rel. vol. 1, p. 12)¹; while the Work itself was publicly and hotly combated from various quarters.

The following answers or attacks are noticed by our author himself in the Preface and first Chapter of his Defence of the present Work, and in the second of the Relation already mentioned. *What appears in the following pages with regard to them, it must be particularly borne in mind, is drawn almost entirely from these and other places of our author's own writings, and must therefore be regarded as expressing HIS account as well of the facts concerning them as of their merits.*

1. The attack of the Journalists of Trevoux, Jesuits, who,—having previously, in their No. for Nov. 1723, p. 2257^m, announced the book as the work “of one of those pacificators in the matter of religion who find reason “in every thing, and whom nothing stops”, led the way to more definite hostilities in a so called “*Extrait*” (see note *k*), which appeared in their No. for March 1724, and in answer to which our author wrote them a severe Letter, dated May 15. 1724, which he has reprinted in the 2d or documentary volume of his Relation: see p. xxi, xxii. This “*Extrait*” is also noticed by him in the Preface (p. vii) and first Chapter (vol. 1, p. 3—5) of the Defence, and in the text of the Relation, vol. 1, Chap. 2, p. 36—39. He complains bitterly of the injustice and malignity with which they had misrepresented his Work; which however, according to his account, was only of a piece with their previous conduct towards him; they having

¹ It may be as well to observe that this Cardinal was a distinct person from *M. l'Abbé Fleury*, the Ecclesiastical historian. The Cardinal (Andrew) was born June 22. 1653, nominated Bp of Frejus Nov. 1. 1698, was consecrated to that See the next year, resigned it on account of ill health in 1715; in which same year he was named by the Will of Louis XIV (who died Sep. 1) preceptor to his great-grandson and successor Louis XV, whose permanent love and confidence he acquired. In 1726 he was made Cardinal, and the same year (at the age of 73), after the dismissal of the Duc de Bourbon, became Premier, which office he continued to hold

for 17 years, until his death, Jan. 29. 1743, in his 90th year.—The Ecclesiastical historian (Claude) was born Dec. 6. 1640; in 1684 made sub-preceptor to the Duc de Bourgogne, father of Louis XV, and the Ducs d'Anjou and Berri, his uncles; in 1684 Abbot of Loc-Dieu; afterwards Prior of Argenteuil; and in 1716 Confessor to Louis XV, during whose minority he died, July 14. 1723 (in Playfair wrongly 1722).—It is remarkable that both Fleury's were employed in forming the mind of Louis XV: they were also both members of the French Academy.

^m Margin of the Relation &c., vol. 1, p. 10.

charged him before,—not indeed by name, but as “Father . . . Librarian of “. . . .”, which they explained to such as wished for explanation,—with being the Editor of the *Bibliothèque Française*, and when he had written them a letter, dated Feb. 22. 1724 (see p. xxii), to complain of the injustice, and state his ability to declare on oath that he had never in any way had any thing to do with the Work in question,—instead of retracting the obnoxious passage in their own Journal, in which it had appeared,—satisfied themselves with sending him, and perhaps no one else, and inserting (see vol. 1, p. 71, 72) in 5 or 6 copies only of their Journal itself, a printed slip of paper, mentioning his letter and declaring in consequence that what they had said *did not relate to him*.

Of their veracity, however, our author relates a specimen too singular not to be recorded. It has been explained that the original of the present Work was printed at Nanci, although the fears of the Bookseller led him to mention only a Brussels publisher. Deceived in consequence by the title-page, these worthy Journalists were caught as it were in a trap, and in their No. for Nov. 1723 pretended to have received intelligence *from Brussels* that a Bookseller of the name of t' Serstevens had printed a Dissertation on the English Ordinations which came “from one of those pacificators” &c. as above. (Relation &c., Chap. 1. p. 9, 10.) But their excuse the next May (p. 946ⁿ) was still more remarkable. “To believe them”, says Courayer, “they had been guilty of it, only through their not “having intercourse enough with heretics to know all their disguises. “But had the want of intercourse with heretics given them intelligence “from Brussels of the publication of a book which was not [as yet] “known there?” (Ibid. p. 10.) The fault of these Journalists was not the knowing too little, but the pretending to know too much.

Such, then, having been their previous conduct, this fresh and more determined attack induced our author to address them the severe Letter which has already been mentioned, and which, as he tells us himself, he wrote “in such a manner as to let them know, that he apprehended less their pens than their intrigues, and that they ill understood their interests in choosing to meddle with a subject of which they “did not know the first elements.” (Rel. vol. 1, p. 38.) Of this same Letter he says: “I hindered its being printed as much as I could, but so “many manuscript copies got dispersed among the public, that in the end “it was published in one of the subsequent volumes of the *Bibliothèque Française*. The suppression of this volume, however, having rendered “this Letter very scarce, and it having been asked back of me on all “sides, I thought I could not do better than give it a place among the “documents which serve as proofs of the facts alleged in the Relation.”

ⁿ Margin of the Relation &c., vol. 1. p. 10.

(Rel. vol. 2, p. 47.) He has placed it accordingly in the 6th Article, in which, after an introductory paragraph (of which the last quotation but one is the conclusion), are contained both his Letters to these Journalists, together with an account of the amende, the amende itself, and two sentences of remark upon it. The 6th Article extends from p. 46 to p. 67: the 2d Letter begins on p. 52.

2. The first regular attempt at an answer was the two Letters "of a Theologian to an Ecclesiastic of his friends", the first relating to the text, the second to the Appendix of our author's Work: 12mo, Paris, 1724. These anonymous Letters were written by the Abbé Gervaise, and are noticed by our author in the Preface (p. vii) and first Chapter (vol. 1, p. 5—7) of the Defence, and in the second Chapter (vol. 1, p. 20, 21) of the Relation; from the latter of which places, supported by an entertaining letter to the Abbot of St. Geneviève,—which with an introductory paragraph and notes forms the 4th Article (p. 35—40) of the 2d (or documentary) volume,—we learn a curious anecdote of the way in which our author had had the misfortune of incurring the displeasure of the Abbé Gervaise, and may also form some notion as well of his merits as an author, as of his credit in other respects; agreeably with which last, after becoming, "from a Carmelite, Abbot of La Trappe", he had become, "from Abbot nothing." (Vol. 1, p. 20.)

The execution of this Critique answered, according to our author, to the principle from which it had been undertaken. As for its fate, "it was suppressed by public authority; and, which may better enable one to judge of its merit, the suppression, which ordinarily gives books a price, did not make it either sell or be sought for." (Ibid. p. 21.)^o

3. "La Dissertation &c." *The Dissertation of Father Le Courayer on the Succession of the English Bishops and on the Validity of their Ordinations refuted by Father Hardouin of the Company of Jesus*. In two small 12mo volumes, of which the first treats the question of fact (*fait*), the second that of principle (*droit*). Paris, 1724.

The author of this Work was a man of amazing learning, but of far too singular views with regard to history, to be capable of doing justice to any question with which history was concerned. In the year 1693 (at the age of 47), in a Work on ancient coins, he had broached the opinion that almost all the writings attributed to the ancients (of Latin books he excepted only Cicero, Pliny, Virgil's Georgics, and the Satires and Epistles of Horace) were forgeries! ("Chronologiæ ex Nummis antiquis restitutæ Prolusio de "Nummis Herodiadum", p. 59—63.)

^o The same writer at a later period published a Critique on our author's translation with notes of Father Paul's History of the Council of Trent: see p. xlix.

This opinion, or at least the expression of it, it is but fair to add, he was required by his superiors, in the year 1707, after its confutation the same year by La Croze, to retract. From a posthumous Work, however, "*Joannis Harduini, Jesuitæ, Ad Censuram Scriptorum Veterum Prolegomena*", printed at London in 1766, it appears that, though he lived to the age of 83, viz. to Sept. 2, 1729, the only alteration of importance which his views had undergone was the substitution of Plautus for Cicero in his quaternion of excepted Latin books! Of Greek Works he excepted only Homer's Iliad and Odyssey, and the nine books of Herodotus. All other ancient writings, whether sacred or profane, except only "the books which the Church accounts canonical and sacred" (p. 1) and the above-mentioned six profane authors, he maintained to have been forged by a wicked set of men for the purpose of overthrowing religion. As to the date of this rather extensive forgery, he thinks, to quote the conclusion of the above Prolegomena, that he has made it clear in his Treatise on the ancient coins of the French Kings (*de Antiquis Numismatibus Regum Francorum*) "that that plan, undertaken by the wicked set, and contrived in the reign of Philip the August [A.D. 1180—1223], began then to make its appearance, but much more under Philip the Fair [1285—1314] and Valois [1328—1350]: then advanced almost without bounds for more than a century and a half." (p. 237.)^P

With such machinery as the preceding, the reader will readily anticipate that the 'refuting' Courayer was not difficult: it was but to suppose a pretty extensive forgery of documents, and the question of fact was settled, —especially as, with a credulity on one side only equalled by his incredulity on the other, the hear-say and self-contradicting story of the Nag's-head Ordination, which was altogether unknown to the earlier Roman Catholic controversialists, is with him a *demonstrated* truth! As to the question of principle, the ancient Liturgies having shared the same fate with the rest of antiquity, this part of his work was already half done to hand. It should be observed, however, that after finishing the first volume, it had been his intention to suppress the second as needless, until, upon the publication of Le Quien's Work (see p. xxiv), his dissatisfaction with the concessions made by that writer induced him once more to change his mind

^P Some lesser flights of this extraordinary author, according to the *Biographie Universelle*, were: 1. His expressing the opinion, in his Commentary on the New Testament, that Our Saviour and His Apostles *preached in Latin!* 2. His setting down such men as Jansen, Quesnel, and Pascal among the *Atheists (!)* he pretended in his *Athet Detecti* to have discovered. 3. His rejecting as spurious the records of all the

Councils previous to that of Trent! Having re-edited himself Labbé and Cossart's Edition of the Councils (Paris 1715), and having been asked (as we are told), "why then did he edit them?" he replied (as is said), that "God and himself alone knew the truth on that head." This Edition, being accused of mutilation and interpolation according to his own judgment, was suppressed by the Government.

(see his Preface to vol. 2), and also to add at the end of this second volume eighty-five pages of Reflections on that Work.

For our author's general ideas of this answer of Hardouin's, see the Preface (p. vii, viii) and first Chapter (vol. 1, p. 7—15) of the Defence, and the second Chapter of the Relation (vol. 1, p. 21—23). Suffice it to say here, that his own opinion was that he was 'refuted' only in the title-page; and it being also his wish to wait until he had all the answers together, it will not appear surprising that he did not feel called upon to defend himself, until after the publication of the more and longer looked for answer of the learned Dominican Orientalist Le Quien (or Lequien), the friend and admirer of the Orientalist Renaudot, in answer to whose *Mémoire* Courayer's Work had originally been undertaken.

4. The title of Le Quien's Work was: "Nullité des Ordinations Anglicanes, ou Refutation &c." *Nullity of the Anglican Ordinations, or a Refutation of the Book entitled, A Dissertation on the Validity of the Ordinations of the English. By the Reverend Father Michel Le Quien, D.D., of the Order of Friars Preachers.* In two volumes 12mo, Paris, 1725; the first as in Hardouin's Work relating to the question of fact (*fait*), the second to that of principle (*droit*). Of the first, however, after a Dedication of nine and a Preface of seventy-one pages, the first five Chapters (to p. 177) are devoted to a preliminary history of the English Reformation as it bore on the Ordinations.

The great aim of its author (or authors: see p. xxvi) was not so much to prove any thing, as to raise doubts in every thing. To effect this every nerve was strained; and "the confusion", says Courayer (Relation, p. 25, 26), "into which he had done his best to throw this subject, his natural talent for enveloping it in obscurity, a number of false facts given out with the same credulity with which he had received them, and become thenceforth more credible by his authority, a common prepossession which men always have willingly in favour of the prejudices of their own party, and which allies itself better than criticism and discernment with a certain air of devotion,—all this made an impression, and suspended for a time that which my first Dissertation had made. The public, ever impatient, and which fancies that it costs no more to search and verify than to imagine and invent, and which six months after saw as yet no reply, thought me already overwhelmed with the weight of the difficulties,—and delayed to pronounce, only through a remnant of equity, which will not allow that we should be condemned without being heard." See more of Le Quien's book *ibid.* p. 25—27: also in the Preface (p. viii) and first Chapter of the Defence (vol. 1. p. 15—20); though in fact the whole of this last Work is little more than an answer to that of Le Quien: see p. xxxi.

5. The next answer was the *Mémoires* (in two volumes 8vo, Paris, 1726) of Fennel, Dean of Laonne,—“in expectation”, adds Courayer, “but in

“reality Director of Nuns at Pontoise” (Def. vol. 1, p. 20). Of this Work our author gives his idea in the Preface (p. viii : see also p. xxiv) and first Chapter (p. 20—23) of the Defence, and in the second Chapter of the Relation, vol. 1, p. 27, 28. Its author he describes (Def. p. 21) as “one of those writers who have the secret of talking much without saying anything, and who, taking words for reasons, think they have demonstrated the facts, before they have so much as entered upon *proof*.” He complains more bitterly of the magnitude of the Work, and the enormous amount of reading inflicted on him, than even of the injustice, and the coarse and vulgar, as well as irrelevant, matter with which it was filled. The first volume, like those of Hardouin and Le Quien, was on the question of fact, though not till after a long Preface on the Sacrifice,—the second, like theirs, on that of principle, in which however he confines himself to proving that, with the Reformation in general, the substitution of Edward’s Ordinal for the Pontifical in particular, was the work of the Lay authority. “This”, says our author, “is perhaps the only difficulty of the Work which can be regarded as serious.” As to the style, “he writes”, says Courayer (ibid. p. 21), “Irish in French ; but this ought to be excused in a foreigner, who makes the whole merit of his Work to consist in its uncommon research, and the solidity of its proofs, rather than in the purity of the style and beauty of the language.” Its author however, it seems, complained both bitterly and fruitlessly that the Journalists of Paris had not given as favourable an account of it as he hoped. (Relation, vol. 1. p. 27, 28.)

6. The Letter of a Benedictine (Pierre Le Blanc, of the Ancient Observance of Clugny) to our author himself, confines itself to a theological difficulty, that of the changes in the Anglican Ordination Service having been made without the authority of Rome; and concludes thence that the Ordination of the Anglicans remains suspicious, and that it would be necessary to have it at least conditionally reiterated. Our author, who gives some account of it in the first Chapter of the Defence (p. 23—26), and in the second of the Relation (p. 28, 29), notices the civility and politeness with which it was written, as an honourable exception to the style and spirit of his opponents in general.

As to the spirit of the rest, of that of the Journalists of Trevoux,—whose so-called “Extrait”, however, cannot properly, as our author observes (Rel. vol. 2. p. 36, 37) be counted among the *answers*, being no more an answer than an Extrait,—of that of the Abbé Gervaise, and of that of Fennel, enough has already been said. As for Hardouin, the indignation one might otherwise be disposed to feel, as well for his sad perversion of facts, as also for his great injustice towards his adversary, may well soften into pity at the contemplation of a man of his amazing learning and powers, fallen into a state of mind bordering on that of a monomaniac, and that so

well understood by the public in general, as to have rendered his most extravagant flights all but harmless.

It remains only to consider the spirit of Le Quien,—of whom it is the more difficult to speak, because, having a reputation to sustain, he is the more cautious what he says, especially of one in whose company he had been, and with whom he had had some correspondence. Courayer also appears cautious in his observations on Le Quien, though he says in the Preface to the Defence (p. viii) that he (Le Quien) “spared him the same “injuries [as Hardouin], only to give himself up with the same facility to “bitterness and suspicions; and more jealous of his own reputation in the “appearance of moderation he shewed, than attentive to the considerations “which propriety and charity required, allowed harsh things to be said of “him by Approvers he had asked for, which he did not venture to say of “him himself.” How far Le Quien was answerable for the expressions of the Censors or Approvers he selected to examine his Work, it may be difficult to say; but it is remarkable that to Pierre Badoire, whose name, together with that of another Doctor of Theology of the Faculty of Paris, is appended to a very laudatory “Approbation” printed at the end, we are told in the *Biographie Universelle* that a great part of the Work itself has been attributed.

He accuses him, too, in spite of his system of doubt as to what was opposed to his views, of adopting readily, without troubling himself to examine, what was to his purpose. See Def. p. 18, 19, and Rel. p. 25—27; in the latter of which places (p. 26, 27),—speaking, as elsewhere in that Work, more freely of individuals, now that he had done with France,—he mentions as an instance, that before Renaudot’s *Mémoire* was answered, no one thought of disputing its authorship, but that as soon as it was seen that it had been refuted with some success, a doubt was attempted to be raised as to whether Renaudot was really the author; that he learnt that Le Quien himself favoured this rumour, and proposed to contest the fact, in order to make it be believed that he (Courayer) attributed the *Mémoire* to that Scholar merely for the sake of giving himself the honour of such an adversary; that however an offer having been made to communicate to him the autograph of Renaudot himself, and the Procureur-Général of the Parliament of Paris having testified to him the authenticity of the *Mémoire*, and the steps taken by Renaudot with himself to get it inserted in the Abbé Gould’s Work,—Le Quien having learnt these facts from some friends of Courayer’s, to whom the latter made no secret of them, lost thenceforth the desire to cavil against him in this respect.

Previously to this, in the second of his two letters (see p. xix, xx) to Des-Fontaines, Editor of the *Journal des Sçavans*, dated Jan. 12, and Feb. 5, 1724, and inserted in that Journal in the Numbers for those months (in the Holland Edition in May), on the subject of his favourable *Extrait* of the *Disser-*

tation in that Journal,—alluding to the announced Work of Le Quien, our author had said that “he should not be found out of fear or misdirected “zeal presenting memorials secretly, or contriving intrigues with the authorities to prevent the printing of his [Le Quien’s] answers”; and it having been represented to Le Quien that Courayer had accused him in private conversation of having taken steps to prevent the Privilege being granted for the Dissertation, and so given ground for a general opinion that himself was aimed at in the above passage, as well as in the Preface to the Dissertation itself (p. 24, l. 3—6), he wrote to our author to complain, and at the same time to deny the imputation in question. Courayer in reply stated that when he wrote his Preface he certainly had no idea of Le Quien, but that since that time he had been informed by a distinguished friend of Le Quien’s that he really had taken such steps as were alluded to; professing however his readiness to believe on Le Quien’s word, that such information had arisen out of mistake, and giving him leave to make what use he pleased of his letter. Le Quien, as Courayer tells us, published his own letter, but not Courayer’s answer. Courayer in his Defence published both letters with an introduction: vol. 4, Appendix, p. ccxix—ccxxix. It may possibly be of consequence towards judging correctly of Le Quien’s conduct in this matter, to know how and when he published his letter.

In our author’s Appendix to the present Work, he gives at length the Edwardine Forms of Ordination of Priests and Bishops, but omits that of Deacons, as not being of consequence to the argument. Le Quien “ever suspicious”, as our author says, with respect to himself, observes, “I will not penetrate into the reasons of this omission”; and proceeds to say that he thought it right to supply it, both as a matter of curiosity, and also to shew that it contained no prayer relative to the Deacon’s Office until after the imposition of hands; a deficiency which he certainly *shews* most effectually, and that by the simplest process in the world, that of *leaving out* what he denies to be there! See his Appendix, at the end of vol. 2, p. lxi—lxviii; where (p. lxiii) this omission is effected by the following abridgement: “*Litania seu Suffragium. Pater de cœlis Deus, &c. ut in Libro Communium Precum. Mox canetur aut recitabitur Communio illius diei,*” (*The Litany or Suffraging. O God the Father, of heaven, &c. as in the Book of Common Prayer. Then shall be sung or said the Communion of that day.*) &c. whereas in reality the Litany at a Deacon’s Ordination was so far from being said “as in the Book of Common Prayer”, that it differed from it in the precise particular of the insertion in the middle, of a petition, and the addition at the end, of a regular prayer, for the persons to be ordained. This looks strange enough; but one may remark that even Courayer himself in answering Le Quien has overlooked the petition in the middle; and it is highly probable that Le Quien’s fault is to be transferred to the author of the Latin

translation he adopted, or got made, for his use. The uncharitable suspicion, however, which he himself appears to insinuate against Courayer, matches ill with the charitable supposition which must be made to excuse himself; and after all, however little a circumstance like this may justify an unfavourable suspicion of his motives, it at least strengthens the observation of Courayer as to the little pains he took to ascertain before publishing, the truth of what appeared to favour his argument,—or anyhow speaks but little for the dependence to be placed on his facts.

With the above paragraphs, however, the reader may compare some very important false quotations and translations of Le Quien's pointed out in the first Chapter of Browne's Examination of the Nag's-head Story, already referred to.

And here it will neither be out of place, nor, probably, uninteresting to the reader, to translate and insert a few of the more striking passages of a letter to M. l'Abbé Sutaine, Prior of St. Geneviève, from an Ecclesiastic to whom the Prior had given or lent Le Quien's Answer, praising the Work himself, and requesting the other to let him know what he thought of it. The letter, (of which however the conclusion was wanting in the copy from which Courayer printed,—probably because it related to other matters) will be found in the 2d or documentary volume of the Relation, of which, with an introductory and a concluding paragraph, it makes the 2d Article, p. 3—23.

“ My very dear and much honoured Prior,—In putting into my hands
 “ Father Le Quien's Answer to Father Le Courayer's Dissertation, you had
 “ given me an impression of it not a little advantageous; but I confess that
 “ an attentive perusal of each of these two Works has altogether destroyed
 “ it. You requested me [¶]*at the same time* to let you know my opinion, and
 “ communicate to you the reflections I made upon it. In order to satisfy
 “ you, I will tell you [¶]*first, that instead* of the moderate and equitable feelings
 “ [¶]*which I expected from Father Le Quien* towards the Author of the Disser-
 “ tation, I see [¶]*in him* on the contrary a man who puts out in many places
 “ the venom of an unjust and malignant criticism, who from the Preface
 “ forward exerts himself to excite envy and dislike against the person he
 “ attacks, who forgets nothing that depends on himself to rouse by various
 “ reproaches, and an infinity of bad turns spread over his whole Work, the
 “ Anglican Theologians, those of the Catholic Church, Rome herself, and, if
 “ he could, the whole Church. Besides this he levels against his adversary
 “ many contemptuous strokes: he treats him as a copier of Bramhall, and if
 “ he does not say broadly that he is heretical, he at least reproaches him in
 “ clear terms, and that more than once, with not being Catholic.”
 (P. 4, 5.)

¶ “ Some words in the copy are effaced “ supply. They are those which are in
 “ here, which it has been necessary to “ italics.”

“* * * Moreover, all taking leave to express their opinions in these years of confusion, a great distinction ought to be made between those who were prepossessed with the Presbyterian opinions and the Episcopalians. Father Le Quien does not appear to have had this distinction sufficiently before his eyes. It is nevertheless of great consequence to an equitable judgment of the opinions of the Anglican Church.” (P. 6.)

“* * * It is true the Censor [Le Quien] gets out of the difficulty by rejecting the authority of Collier and Fox. It is a liberty which he takes in almost every page of his Work to reject all the authors; but I can hardly believe that the public will choose to allow it him.” (P. 7.)

“* * * But what is intolerable, and merits the whole indignation of the public, is to see the unfairness of which the Censor is guilty towards Father Courayer with respect to a fact relating to Pius IV, and which the author had related, and given for what it was worth, on the faith of Camden. Father Le Quien there gives himself up altogether to injustice and bad faith. He explains the opinion of his adversary in the most odious way, and draws against him inferences equally unjust and offensive. I confess that in reading this passage the blood boiled in all my veins.” (P. 8.)

“* * * What Father Le Quien says in favour of the authenticity of what they had chosen to impute to Dr. Morton, and which had been so solidly refuted before-hand, is altogether pitiable; and it is astonishing that a man of ability should have given credit to these reports of some zealous Jesuits, who thought they could amuse the public with their fables. Father Le Quien does very prudently to add at the end of these testimonies, that the disavowal of Morton must be immaterial. He would have done still better if he had not mentioned it at all.” (P. 8, 9.)

“* * * It is true that in all this Chapter he confines himself to making doubtful the Ordination of Parker, and merely probable the ridiculous story of the Tavern. But all the conjectures which he lavishes to give his fable some resemblance to truth, will never produce an at all reasonable doubt in the minds of persons capable of any discernment.” (P. 9.)

“* * * But what one cannot sufficiently wonder at is, that one who has been a Professor of Theology, and exercised in criticism, should not have felt the force of the argument which he furnished himself, by producing these testimonies, against the fable of the Tavern. Certainly Stapleton and the rest abandon themselves to a violence against the Bishops which shews plainly that they did not wish to spare them any part either of the deficiency or of the disgrace of their *ridiculous* Consecration, as they designate it. They were, according to Father Le Quien, very well informed as to all that was done, they wrote a short time after the things took place: what probability is there that they would have omitted a story so well adapted to discredit these very Ordinations, which

“they had so good a wish to render ridiculous altogether? Say what one will, this silence deposes in a demonstrative and very eloquent manner against the fable of the Tavern.” (P. 11.)

“* * * Father Courayer has anticipated, and very plausibly explained, the difficulties which his adversary makes with regard to the difference of the names and of the number of the Consecrators of Parker. It seems that the latter has not been willing to take heed. He would have done better to content himself with the little there is on the subject in the Dissertation, and not to notice this trifle. What embroilings, what rashness, what liberty in forming conjectures and suspicions! What temerity in accusations of forgery in all that the Censor says to weaken the authority of the Lives of Parker [see p. xxxvii with note *y*], while in the second Addition at the end of his book he begins to make his recantation.

“In the examination which Father Le Quien makes of the evidences by which the Lambeth Records are established, there appears no longer any reserve. There, in truth, whatever care he may take to forewarn his readers, he contests and supposes without end. What can one say in answer to an author who rejects without any consideration documents which appear most authentic, and which support one another? * * *” (P. 12, 13.)

“* * * But how came Father Le Quien not to see that all he relates of the precautions which Queen Elizabeth took to assure herself that all was in right form in the Registers of Lambeth, forms against him an argument on which there would be many important observations to make? So far from it, he uses it as a proof on his side, and by it even pretends to triumph. A fine thing certainly is a lively and fruitful imagination!” (P. 13.)

“* * * Father Le Quien explains very ill what the author of the Dissertation says of the power which National Churches have of regulating the formulæ of their Sacraments. He makes him confound those which are schismatical with those which have continued Catholic, although he has entirely distinguished them, and reasoned very differently about the one and the other. It is in the darkness of this confusion that Father Le Quien is guilty of injustice altogether discreditable towards Father Courayer, and draws against him the most odious consequences. * * *” (P. 18.)

“* * * Father Le Quien would have one judge of the whole work of this Reformation by what he supposes to have been not merely in their mouth, but also in their heart. He would have one pay no regard to what has been written in favour of the Priesthood, or the Sacrifice, by the English Divines or other authors, who expressed themselves either at the same time, or a little after. This is not fair.” (P. 19.)

“* * * One may say that he omits nothing to sound and even put

“ to the rack, so to speak, the divinity and the faith itself of the man he is
 “ refuting. But *frustra jacitur rete ante oculos pennatorum* [‘ in vain is the
 “ ‘ net spread in the eyes of any winged thing’ (Prov. i. 17)]. With what-
 “ ever malignity Father Le Quien may explain the sentiments of Father Le
 “ Courayer, whatever turns he may employ to shew that he has thought too
 “ ill of the Sacrifice of the Catholic, and too well of that of the Anglican
 “ Church, that he *even speaks no otherwise than the Protestants*; we see
 “ plainly in the little the latter has written on the subject, that his opinions
 “ are more circumspect than those of his adversary, that they are free from
 “ all blemish, and that he will have but to explain himself a little more at
 “ length to cover him with an eternal confusion, by shewing in a clear light
 “ his bad faith, and the dishonourable injury he does to all the rules of pro-
 “ bity and courtesy, both natural and Christian.

“ The Author of the Dissertation has never pretended to blame the prac-
 “ tice of the Church of Rome, nor to pronounce on her custom of re-ordain-
 “ ing the English Ministers who return to her bosom. He only thought
 “ that the question had not been sufficiently discussed, and that it might be
 “ permitted to well-intentioned theologians to apply themselves to clear up
 “ the facts and remove the doubts which exist on this matter, without
 “ attempting to prejudice the right which the Church alone has to pro-
 “ nounce on this important point of her discipline. For whatever Father Le
 “ Quien may allege, he will not prove that there is any sufficiently solemn
 “ decree by which the Church has clearly enough explained herself in favour
 “ of this re-ordination. And certainly he is greatly in the wrong to decry his
 “ adversary’s intentions, or endeavour to substitute for his such as he
 “ never had.” (P. 20, 21.)

“ * * * Above all I cannot excuse his having perverted in various
 “ places the expressions and sentiments of his adversary, in order to take
 “ against him advantages unworthy of a man of honour, that so he may
 “ combat him more at his ease.” (P. 22.)

This Critique sounds severe; but the reader will perceive that its author, notwithstanding the more favourable opinion of Le Quien’s Work which the Prior of St. Geneviève appears to have expected from him, enters almost entirely into the views of Courayer; and will make accordingly such allowance as he may think proper.

Of all the Answers, however, which were made to the Dissertation, that of Le Quien appeared to our author not merely “ the most considerable” (Def. vol. 1. p. 27, 28), but also “ the only rational” reply; and accordingly it is against it, properly speaking, that his Defence is directed (Def. p. 28); although he treats, at the same time, in their proper place, all such points worthy of notice in the other Works, as had either escaped the attention of Le Quien, or been better handled by others.

This second Work being ready, our author requested the Privilege and

had a Censor allowed him as usual. It was sent to the Abbé de Villiers, a Censor whom he knew only by reputation, and by whom it was approved, on the author's promise to alter some passages which appeared too piquant and satirical. The Approbation (dated June 14. 1726), together with the Censor's note to the bookseller, dated June 15. 1726 (in which the alterations are alluded to), an introductory paragraph, and an annotation to the note, form the 8th Article (p. 70—72) of the 2d or documentary volume of the Relation. As before, however, "no account was made of "the Approbation, and the Jesuits", says our author (Rel. vol. 1. c. 3. p. 45, 46), "possessing the confidence of the Keeper of the Seals, and being "the only persons consulted as to the printing of books which concern "Theology, had the Privilege refused, and obliged me to take some secret "steps for the printing of my Defence."

"In spite", continues he (p. 46), "of the Inquisition established at Paris "against everything which is published contrary to the views of those who "govern, it did not fail to find a printer, and was in a condition to appear "at the end of 1726." It was printed,—according to the Allgemeine Encyclopædie of Leipsic 1818, at Rouen,—according to Quérard's La France Littéraire (see p. xvi), at Paris,—although, as before, only the same Brussels publisher's name appeared on the title-page.

This second Work consists of two double volumes, each containing two 12mo parts of a size considerably larger than that of either the two parts or volumes of the Dissertation, and which as in the case of the Dissertation itself, seem generally to have been referred to (as by the present Editor) as so many volumes. So amongst the rest Quérard and the author of the Extraits in the Journal des Sçavans of February and April 1727 (see p. xxxiii).—The former half (or double-volume), as in the Works of Hardouin, Le Quien, and Fennel, is devoted to the question of fact (*fait*), the latter, as in theirs, to that of principle (*droit*); nearly half however of the last quarter of the Work, being occupied, as in the case of the Dissertation, with an Appendix of Documents.

The title is: "Défense de la Dissertation &c." *A Defence of the Dissertation on the Validity of the Ordinations of the English against the different Answers which have been made to it, with the Proofs establishing the facts advanced in this Work.—By the Author of the Dissertation. . . . Brussels, . . . M.DCC.XXVI.*

This Work, like the one it was written to defend, was of course differently received by different persons, but in general, as our author tells us (Rel. vol. 1. p. 47), the voice of the public was on his side. He gives us in particular (*ibid.* p. 47—49) extracts from four letters of praise written during the middle of 1727^r, and adds (p. 49) that he received at that time an infinity

^r One of these, dated May 28, speaks of and Aug. 20, were addressed to him. him; the rest, dated May 10, June 13,

of similar ones. The Editor too of the *Journal des Sçavans*, notwithstanding the caution which his former reprimand was calculated to inspire, gave such an account as shewed his opinion of it in two *Extraits*, the one relating to the question of fact and published in the February Number, the other relating to that of principle and intended to be published in that of April, but suppressed by M. D'Armenonville Keeper of the Seals, though not in time to prevent the escape of a few copies containing the *Extrait* in question, which was afterwards re-printed. Our author has given both *Extraits* in the 2d or documentary volume of the *Relation*, of which, with an introductory paragraph, they form the 9th Article (p. 72—108, the first beginning p. 73, the second p. 89). These *Extraits* appear very useful towards obtaining a good general view of the Work; the plan of which, however, is sketched by the author himself in the first Chapter, vol. 1. p. 27—37. For this purpose too, the Tables of Contents found in the several volumes, which (like that added at the end of the original Dissertation, but in the present Edition incorporated into the Editor's General Epitome) are lists of the titles of the several Chapters and of the Documents, may of course be consulted with advantage.—The following pretty full account the reader may be glad to find here.

I. In Vol. I, after a Preface of xxviii pages, is contained,

1. "Book I, in which the author confines himself to certain prejudices, and certain general observations, which prepare the way and conduct naturally to the determination of the fact." Of this Book the first Chapter is headed, "An idea of all the answers which have been made to the Dissertation on the Validity of the Anglican Ordinations. Plan of the Defence of this Dissertation." The second, "Learned Catholics have thought the Ordinations of the English valid before me. It was certainly the opinion of the late M. Bossuet. Rome has never had this question examined juridically, nor decided the contrary. The usage of re-ordaining, founded on doubts not yet cleared up for want of documents communicated to her, is a wise precaution, but cannot have the force of law. It is altogether to the advantage of the Catholic Church to recognise the validity of these Ordinations." The third, "Difference of the ways which have been chosen for attacking the validity of the Ordinations of the English. Reflections on these variations." The 4th is against the supposition of the forgery of the Records in general; the 5th deals with "the contradictions found between some authors and the Registers of Cranmer and Parker". The 6th and last is headed, "The length of time which elapsed before the production of the Register of Parker, does not prove its forgery, nor even throw upon it the slightest suspicion."

2. "Book II, in which is examined the story of the Tavern and all which has been adduced to gain it any credibility." The heading of Chap. 1. is, "Refutation of the principal foundation of the Tavern Ordination. They

“were in no want at that time of consecrated Bishops to perform the Consecration of Barlow. If Barlow had not been recognised as certainly consecrated, they would never have thought of him for this function.” Of Chap. 2, “The story of the Ordination of Parker in a Tavern is fabulous in all its circumstances, and indefensible in all its parts.” Of Chap. 3, “The efforts which are made to diminish the ridiculousness of the fable serve only to augment it. The authorities which are adduced to defend it are more fit to discredit it than to make one receive it.” Of Chap. 4, “Examination of the testimonies of the Catholic Divines. The fabulous Ordination of the Tavern cannot be rested on them.” Of the 5th and last Chapter, “The Certificate of Lord Audley in favour of the fable of the Tavern bears every imaginable character of forgery. Even though it should be genuine, no comparison can be made between it and the Declaration of Bishop Morton, which is directly contrary to it.”

II. In Vol. II. is contained “Book III, in which is established by new documents the certainty of the Lambeth Ordination, as well as of that of Barlow and Scory, and in which are refuted all the unfounded difficulties which are objected against them.” Of this Book, Chap. 4 begins by shewing that “The contest of Bonner against Horn, far from throwing suspicion on the Ordination of Lambeth, completes the establishing of it.” Six Chapters are spent on the Ordination of Parker, four on that of Barlow, and one on that of Scory.

III. In Vol. III. is contained “Book IV, in which the forms of Ordination, the Sacrifice, and the Priesthood, are treated of.” In this Book he maintains the sufficiency of the Ordinal of Edward, and while he contends that “the validity of the Ordinations of the English is altogether independent of what they may think of the Sacrifice”, he denies that they have as a Church rejected that doctrine. He maintains also (in Chap. 5), that the doctrine of the Sacrifice is drawn by the Fathers and Divines not from the real presence (though true), but from the representation and memory of our Saviour's death; but that, even supposing that presence necessary to the idea of the Sacrifice, “that which the English admit would suffice for a spiritual Sacrifice, such as is that of the Church.” In Chap. 7 he maintains that the Priesthood which the English reject is but a chimerical Priesthood which they attribute to the Church of Rome. The 10th and last Chapter is headed, “There is no [*in the Table of Contents* almost no] room to doubt that Deacons^s have often been ordained Bishops without receiving previously the Priestly Ordination.”

IV. In Vol. IV is contained,

(A) “Book V, in which the Ordinal of Edward is treated of, and it is examined by whom it was drawn up.” In the 3d Chapter he maintains

^s Quære, *Arch-Deacons*, or *Cardinal-Deacons*?—Hallier, in his celebrated Work on Orders, maintains the contrary of our author's position.

the probability of the truth of the offer of Pius IV. In the 4th he examines 'some other incidental facts adduced in the Answers made to the Dissertations'. The 5th is headed, "There ought not to remain any doubt as to the validity of the Ordinations of England. It is not every kind of doubt that is sufficient to require the reiteration of a Sacrament. Maxims to be followed on this head." The 6th and last, "Recapitulation and conclusion of this Treatise."

(B) An Appendix of Documents.

Of this the first Article contains, after an introduction, (a) A Certificate, dated May 20. 1726, of the Very Rev. Father Fr. de Riberolles, late Abbot of St. Geneviève, and Superior General of the Canons Regular of the Congregation of France, with respect to Bossuet's opinion of the Anglican Orders, especially on the occasion of an abjuration which took place in 1690. (b) A letter (not entire), dated Nov. 25. 1724, from M. Caldaguez Precentor of the Church of Montferrand, concerning the opinion of that Prelate in 1699, shewing that the doubt he had formerly had with respect to Cromwell was then entirely cleared up, and at the same time speaking very highly of the present Work (see p. xix). (c) An extract from a letter of M. Arnaud, Doctor of the Sorbonne, to the Bishop of Castorie, in favour of the validity of the English Ordinations. (d) A Latin letter of 9 close pages, dated Mar. 2. 1685, from M. Snellaerts, Doctor and Professor of Louvain, to the same Prelate, and to the same effect.

Art. 2 is headed, "Different Statutes [see p. 302] of Parliament", and contains more or less of the Acts,—1. of the 25th of Henry VIII on the subject of Elections,—2. of the 1st of Eliz. on that of the Oath of Supremacy,—3. of the 8th of Eliz. on that of the Ordinations at the beginning of her reign,—4. of the 13th of Eliz. on that of Ministers ordained by any other Form than that of Edward VI,—and 5. of the 39th of Eliz. on that of the titles of the Anglican Clergy to their benefices.

Art. 3, "A Table of the Records contained in the first part of the Register of Parker." The object is to shew the impossibility of forgery.

Art. 4, "Records to prove the Consecration of Latimer, Ridley, and Ferrar." These three having been degraded, before they were put to death, from the Priesthood alone^t, the production of these documents is intended to shew that they who thus refused to recognise their Episcopate could have had no better reason for so doing, than that they were ordained in schism^t. The first was made Bishop of Worcester in 1535: the Record of his Consecration is not found in Cranmer's Register, but the Act of Investiture (dated Oct. 4) is in Rymer (vol. 14, p. 553), and twice mentions his

^{tt} In the case, however, of Latimer and Ridley, at least, the degrading them from the Priesthood alone was directly contrary to the Commission of Cardinal Pole:—see more p. 230 A (i. e. p. 230, paragraph 1).

having been consecrated, besides which there is in the Register of the Dean and Chapter of Worcester (lib. 3, fol. 16) a letter of the Prior of Worcester Cathedral, addressing him as Bishop, and inserting a letter of Latimer's as Bishop to the Prior, dated Sept. 15. 1537, and also a Record in Cranmer's Register (fol. 215) of his having joined in the Consecration of Holbeach on the 24th of March the same year. Ridley was consecrated Bishop of Rochester according to the Roman Pontifical in the beginning of Edward VI's reign, Sept. 1. 1547, the Record of his Consecration still remaining in Cranmer's Register (fol. 321). Ferrar was consecrated Bishop of St. David's (to succeed Barlow) by the first Ordinal of Edward, Sept. 9. 1548, the Record of his Consecration also remaining in Cranmer's Register (fol. 327*b*).

Art. 5 is the Record of the Consecration of Poynet, to succeed Ridley in Rochester, June 29. 1550; proving both the Consecration itself, and also that the new Ordinal was then in use.

Art. 6 of that of Hooper Bishop of Gloucester March 8. 1550, intended, with the accompanying Certificates of the Notary, to prove that this Consecration was subsequent to that of Poynet, and that the Record itself had not been transposed in the Register.

Art. 7 "Records of the Consecration of the Consecrators of Parker", containing,—besides the Records from Cranmer's Register of the fact itself of the Consecration of Scory, Coverdale (in whose case, however, the Record is abridged), and the Suffragans of Thetford and Bedford (of whom the former was appointed by Elizabeth to be one of Parker's Consecrators, the latter actually was so),—other confirmatory documents, amongst which is included a Royal Commission, from Rymer (vol. 15. p. 687), dated Sep. 29. 1570, addressed to the Archbishop of York, to confirm the Suffragan of Thetford to the Bishopric of the Isle of Man, and twice attesting his Consecration. Scory and Coverdale were consecrated Bishops of Rochester and Hereford according to Edward VI's first Ordinal Aug. 30. 1551; the Suffragans of Thetford and Bedford according to the Roman Pontifical, the former (John Salesbury) Mar. 19. 153 $\frac{5}{8}$, the latter (John Hodgkin) Dec. 9. 1537.

Art. 8 contains "Extracts from the Register of the Chapter of the Metropolitan Church of Canterbury, and from those of the Court of Prerogatives during the vacancy of the Metropolitan See occasioned by the death of Cardinal Pole", proving that Parker was not confirmed before the 9th nor after the 11th of Dec. 1559, and that he was not consecrated before the 15th.

Art. 9, "Extract from Parker's Register", proving that on the 19th Parker was already consecrated, but that the See of London was still vacant, that the See of Ely was still vacant on the 21st of the same December, and that of Sarum on the 17th of the following January.

Art. 10, "Proofs of the Consecration of Sands^u, Jewel^x, and Horn"; proving at the same time that they were not consecrated till after the date assigned in the Nag's-head story.

Art. 11, "New proofs of the forgery of the Attestation of Lord Audley."

Art. 12, "List of a number of copies of the book *De Antiquitate Britannicæ Ecclesiæ* of the London Edition of 1572." The number is 21, of which 13 contained the *Matthæus*, or Latin Life of Parker, after those of the 69 previous Archbishops. The list was furnished by Drake to Abp Wake Nov. 15. 1724, when he (Drake) had nearly finished his new Edition of that Work.

Art. 13 contains some "MS. notes found in some copies of the 1572 Edition of the Book of the Antiquities, and which prove its existence."

Art. 14, "Fragment of the place of the two Lives of Parker^y in which mention is made of his Consecration."

Art. 15, "Records proper to fix the time of the Consecration of Grindal"; i. e. to confirm Parker's Register.

Art. 16, "Letter of His Grace the Abp. of Canterbury on the handwriting of Parker's Register."

Art. 17, "Collection of Records concerning Barlow", the 1st of which that of his Confirmation for the See of St. David's Ap. 21. 1536, "himself being present",—the 2d, that of his admission into the House of Lords June 30, and attendance there July 1, 4, 6, 7, 10, 12, 14, 15, 17, 18, with a certificate of his name being entered *W.* in the Journal of that House, not *T.* as in the Register of Writs copied by Rymer,—the 3d, Certificates of certain errors in Rymer—the 4th, the Record of his Installation at Chichester,—the 5th, Extracts of certain Ordinations by Barlow in the Diocese of Chichester,—the 6th, Extracts from a MS. Treatise entitled *Speculum Protestantismi*, composed by a Roman Catholic great nephew of Barlow's, and

^u Otherwise *Sandes* or *Sandys*. The omission of the second vowel in writing was owing of course to its having previously been dropped in pronunciation.

^x Our author writes his name systematically *Iwel*.

^y I. e. the above *Matthæus*, and "another Life of him (in many passages substantially the same) contained in 'a little Latin book, belonging to' Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, 'called *Historiola*, being a MS. declaring briefly the History of the Foundation and the successive Masters of that College' (of whom Parker was one); 'writ by the Archbishop's own directions about the year 1569, and still preserved with great esteem in the College' (Strype, Parker bk. iv. c. 42:—there are two copies of the MS. in C.C.C. Library, the older of

"them in the handwriting of [John] Jocelyn [the Archbishop's Secretary]; see below "p. 85, note f, and Master's Hist. of "C.C.C. p. 113. ed. Lamb.)" Editor's Notes (see p. xiv, note o) to the Anglo-Catholic Library Edition of Bramhall's Consecration of Protestant Bishops, p. 12. note f. This last mentioned Life was translated into English by a determined Puritan, and published, together with a virulent invective against the *De Antiquitate Eccl. Brit.* (of which the translator had seen a copy without the *Matthæus*), in the year 1574, without mention of place or name. *Ibid.*; where and in the other valuable notes to, as well as in the text of, the Postscript occupying p. 11—14, other interesting particulars concerning both this and the *Matthæus*, as well as the rest of the *De Antiquitate*, will be found.

preserved in the family, in which he is mentioned as having been consecrated Bishop of St. David's in 1536.

Art. 18 contains "Some ancient Formulæ of Sacerdotal Ordination."

Art. 19, the Anglican "Formulary for the Ordination of Deacons". (See p. 29, 30).

Art. 20, the "Order of the Gallican Liturgy."

Art. 21, the "Order of the Second Liturgy of Edward."

Art. 22, "A Memoire in vindication of the Author of the Dissertation "on the Validity of the Ordinations of the English against an anonymous libel intituled *Important Observations &c.*"

Art. 23, the already mentioned "Letters of the Reverend Fathers Le Quien and Le Courayer" to one another. (See p. xxvi, xxvii.)

Art. 24, the letter of our author to Mr Williams which is found prefixed to the English Editions of the present Work. (See p. 11—13.) Part of the introductory paragraph has already been quoted: see p. x.

Art. 25, further errata for the present Work.

Besides these documents themselves, there is interspersed also a considerable amount of introductory and explanatory matter not noticed above, and for which this general mention must suffice.

To this elaborate Work (of which an English translation, in two thick 8vo volumes, was published in London the next year) Father Hardouin replied in two small volumes which our author in the Preface to the Relation, p. viii—xi, characterizes as follows:

"In fact the Work which Father Hardouin has opposed to my Defence exceeds even the extravagances of his former production. It is from the

^z These Observations were the production of the Coadjutor of Orleans, and related, not to the question of the Anglican Orders, but to our author's incidental treatment of the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice. (See above, in the contents of vol. III.) They had been presented by their author (or nominal author, for according to Courayer they were attributed to Du Mesnil, Almoner to the Bishop of Orleans), first in manuscript, and afterwards, in 1726, in print, to the Assembly of the Clergy, both times without immediate effect. Before they were published, which was on the day preceding that of the Second Assembly, our author had requested in vain, by a letter dated Aug. 28. 1726, the opportunity of explaining what the Coadjutor might think incorrect in his views, and failing of this, published afterwards the Memoire in question. See the Relation, vol. 1, chap. 2, p. 29—36. The letter, as well as one (dated Oct. 2. 1726) of a Doctor of the Sorbonne (without the name), commending the Memoire, but

giving our author some hints of prudence, make, together with two paragraphs of explanation, the 6th Article (p. 40—46, the second letter occupying p. 45 and half of 46) of the 2d or documentary volume. On the very serious results which this controversy, which however does not directly concern the question of the Anglican Orders occasioned to our author, more will be said hereafter.

Before the publication of this Memoire it may be here mentioned, there had been circulated in Paris a manuscript letter of very burlesque character, addressed to our author, but of which he did not learn the writer's name,—ridiculing most of the answers to the Dissertation, but especially the theological fancies of Hardouin, and taunting Le Quien with a partnership fit only to dishonour him. Our author would have reprinted it in the 2d or documentary volume of the Relation, had it turned out more serious, and had not some of its expressions been too low. Relation vol. 1, chap. 2, p. 36.

“ beginning to the end the most complete romance which perhaps has yet
 “ appeared in a serious disputation. Neither Manuscripts nor printed Works
 “ stop him. All that is opposed to him is, according to him, either forged
 “ or ante-dated,—as well the Editions of the books as the public Registers.
 “ It is no longer the simple Record of the Consecration of Parker, it is no
 “ longer his Register alone ; it is all those of Lambeth, of Canterbury, of
 “ London, of Bath, of Winchester, of Worcester, of the Court of Pre-
 “ rogatives ; it is the Journal of the Parliament itself, and all the public
 “ documents, from the authority of which he cannot otherwise disengage
 “ himself, than by endeavouring to persuade us that they are forged ; and it
 “ is the same with the printed Works. Some letters altered in the names,
 “ a thing of which there are a thousand examples in the Registers of
 “ England, where the names are spelt less regularly and less uniformly
 “ than everywhere else, suffice to make him multiply or confound at his
 “ pleasure those persons whose names are written with some slight dif-
 “ ference. Conjectures the most absurd are placed on a level with facts
 “ established by the public Records ; and this man, who sees nothing but
 “ fiction in all that is attested by the Registers and historians, cannot com-
 “ prehend how one can doubt for a moment of the truth of the Tavern
 “ Ordination, and sees as clearly as the day that it has been but for the
 “ sake of obscuring this history that the ingenious design has been con-
 “ ceived of forging new Registers in the Churches and Lay Courts of
 “ England. I say nothing of the theology of this Father. It is of the
 “ same stamp with his historical criticism, and that is saying all ; or rather
 “ it is not saying enough, and the most favourable opinion that can be
 “ formed of either is, that there is there something more criminal than ex-
 “ travagance. Does it become me to engage anew with such a writer ? I
 “ have sufficiently made him known : his reputation will be my excuse
 “ for the rest.^a”

“ To this Work”, continues our author, “ there succeeded one of another
 “ kind, and equally frivolous in its way. It was that of the Rev. Father
 “ Théodoric de St. René, a Carmelite, who without pretending to meddle
 “ with the facts, and supposing almost everywhere their truth, carries us
 “ through all kinds of doubts and speculations altogether foreign to the
 “ purpose,” &c. &c. Ibid. p. xi, xii. “ To this”, says he, “ I have but one
 “ answer to make, which is, that if such reasonings could be admitted, there
 “ is no error, nor schism, nor heresy, of which one might not make use to
 “ prove the invalidity of the Ordination of those involved therein ;” &c. &c.
 Ibid. p. xii.

^a Besides this attack, the same Father made a charge of forgery against our author in the *Journal de Trevoux* of May, 1727. To repel this accusation, the latter published a Letter to Lord Percival, dated June 6. 1727, a reprint of which, with an introductory paragraph, forms the 12th Article, p. 129—147, of the second (or documentary) volume of the *Relation*.

“Accordingly”, adds our author (*ibid.* p. xiv), “in spite of all these pretended doubts, and the alleged forgery of the Registers and public Records, the *Sieur Vivant*, who has written since these two authors, admits fairly the validity of the Ordinations which it has been endeavoured to render suspicious, and the little solidity there is in the doubts which it has been wished to employ against them. He even adds that it is only the refusal of the English to reunite themselves to the Church that gives any longer any force to the prejudices entertained against them, and that these would soon cease, if they were willing to destroy this wall of division which separates us.” *M. Vivant's* observations on his incidental propositions our author dismisses in a very few words.

“The English Work of an anonymous Jesuit”, though published after the Defence, is directed only against the Dissertation, and, according to our author, “is but an ill assorted compilation of all the fables which had been put forward against the Ordination of Parker, and a cento extracted from different places of Father Hardouin and Father Le Quien translated into English;” and so little satisfied even its author that he restored it to the obscurity in which it had been conceived.” *Ibid.* p. xvi, xvii.

Besides the foregoing Works, our author notices also in the same Preface some anonymous and still more obscure replies, viz. :

1. A Letter of a coarse and burlesque character, intended, as he supposes, to gain its author notoriety in some coffee-houses, and such as it would have been making himself ridiculous to have made any account of. P. xix.

2. A letter or article in the London Journal, the writer of which, “after having done justice”, says our author, “to the force of my proofs, and to the success with which I had defended the validity of the Anglican Ordinations, judged me in great errors, if I did not believe that every Society had the same right to appoint its own Ministers as its own Magistrates”, &c. P. xix, xx.

3. Two manuscript letters, to our author, in the first of which, dated Oct. 1727, i. e. a year after the publication of the Defence, its writer would have had him prove that schism does not render an Ordination invalid, and because *in a Work published a year before* he found no reply to “a difficulty” (says our author) “so common and so often cleared up”, suspecting him of duplicity and dissimulation, applies to him in the second, dated July 10. 1728, the text (Rom. 3, 4) *Est autem Deus verax, omnis autem homo mendax* : (But God is true, and every man a liar.) P. xxi, xxii.

Such being, according to our author's account, the character of the answers opposed, up to the year 1729, to the Defence, it is not wonderful that he should have thought it sufficient briefly to notice each in the Preface of his “Relation &c.”, published that year; from which the pith of his remarks has been given above. When however a second Work of Le

Quien's appeared, "La Nullité &c." *The Nullity of the Anglican Ordinations demonstrated anew, as well by the facts as by principle* ("tant par les faits que par le droit"), in answer to the *Defence of the Reverend Father Le Courayer*: Paris, 1730, in two volumes 12mo,^b he yielded, though not till after some hesitation, to the opinion of his friends, and gave to the world a further 12mo volume of some magnitude, intitled "Supplément aux deux Ouvrages &c." *A Supplement to the two Works drawn up in Defence of the Validity of the Anglican Ordinations, intended as a Last Reply to the new Work of Father Le Quien on this subject, and to the Censures of certain Bishops of France* [see p. xlv, and p. xlv, note i]. By *Father Le Courayer, Canon Regular of St. Geneviève. Amsterdam, published by the Company. MDCCXXXII.*

Of this Supplement, in its Preface, consisting of xxviii pages, he speaks as follows: "Accordingly I doubted for some time whether I ought to leave this Work [Le Quien's second] without reply, or give myself once more the sad satisfaction of noticing the blunders, the falsehoods, and the malignity of an adversary who has prostituted so sadly the reputation he had acquired before, and which I should have been willing to have preserved him even at the expense of my own, had I not feared that the truth would thereby receive some damage. It is this fear alone which has made me yield to the opinion of some respectable persons, who have represented to me that, if there was nothing to add to the authenticity of the documents, and to the force of the proofs, which had been published in my Dissertation and Defence in favour of the validity of the Anglican Ordinations, it was at least of some importance to let the public know the extent to which my adversaries had discovered their ignorance of the facts, of the customs, and of the Registers of England, the knowledge of which is absolutely necessary in historical questions; and that on this ignorance alone are founded the greater part of their difficulties, which a little more diligence or sincerity would have prevented or dissipated." (p. iii, iv.)

The "Table of Chapters", i. e. of Contents, is as follows:

" Chap. I. Idea of the new Work of Father Le Quien, and comparison of it with the other. General reflections on the new imagination of the author.	Page 1.
" Chap. II. Odious conduct of Father Le Quien in his new Work. He has had no regard therein either for the rules of civility or for those of truth.	22.
" Chap. III. Ignorance of Father Le Quien in all that concerns England. His perpetual mistakes form almost always the foundation of his criticism.	44.

^b In this Work are contained the Oxford diploma (see p. xlvi) with our author's letter of thanks, Renaudot's Memoire, a letter of the Abbé Gould's to Le Quien himself, and the censure of St. Germain (see p. xlv).

- “ *Chap. IV.* New system substituted for the fable of the Tavern.
 “ Nothing more vainly imagined than Father Le Quien’s distinction
 “ between the Bishops made under Elizabeth up to (*jusqu’ en*) 1562 and
 “ those who were nominated afterwards. 75.
- “ *Chap. V.* The process of Bonner against Horn on the subject of the
 “ Oath of Supremacy, proves clearly that there was no distinction between
 “ the Bishops of the commencement of the reign of Elizabeth, and that
 “ they were all equally ordained. 103.
- “ *Chap. VI.* We find nothing, either in the Controversialists of Eliza-
 “ beth’s time, or in those who came after them, to favour the pretended
 “ distinction of Bishops of Elizabeth’s time. 134.
- “ *Chap. VII.* Continuation of the same subject. The chimerical dis-
 “ tinction of Father Le Quien is supported neither by Sanders nor by
 “ Stapleton. 170.
- “ *Chap. VIII.* It is false that the Anglican Controversialists knew
 “ nothing of the Consecration of the first Bishops; and even though they
 “ had said nothing of it, their silence cannot weaken the steadfast and uni-
 “ form deposition of all the public Records. 203.
- “ *Chap. IX.* Defence of the authenticity of the Registers of Canterbury
 “ against the false criticism of Father Le Quien. Ignorance or malignity
 “ form the foundation of all his remarks. 224.
- “ *Chap. X.* Short remarks on the new criticism which Father Le Quien
 “ makes on the Records of Parker, and the proofs which he opposes to
 “ them. 256.
- “ *Chap. XI.* Father Le Quien has in no degree weakened the proof
 “ drawn from the Life of Parker. New mistakes of this Father on this
 “ subject. 286.
- “ *Chap. XII.* The new remarks of Father Le Quien on the subject of
 “ Barlow do not weaken in any degree the proofs which have been given
 “ of his Consecration in the Defence. 315.
- “ *Chap. XIII.* The new Ordinal drawn up under Edward, and re-esta-
 “ blished under Elizabeth, does not differ in anything essential from the
 “ ancient Pontificals. 347.
- “ *Chap. XIV.* The Ordinal of Edward was never declared insufficient by
 “ any juridical judgment of the Church, either under Mary, or since her
 “ death. 377.
- “ *Chap. XV.* It is not true that the Ordinal of Edward was the work of

^c In his new Work Le Quien, accord-
 ing to our author, gave up the Nag’s-head
 story, but maintained that that of the Lam-
 beth Ordination was equally unfounded;

and that it was not till after the autho-
 rizing of the Edwardine Ordinal by Con-
 vocation in 1563*, that the Bishops began
 to be ordained according to it.

* By the Parliament it appears to have been authorized,—as already included by Statute in the
 Second Prayer Book of Edward VI,—in the beginning of the reign of Elizabeth; but a doubt having
 been raised on the subject, a declaratory Act was passed in 1566.

“ the secular authority. Remarks on what our author says anew on this point and on that of the Supremacy of the Kings of England. 410.

“ *Chap. XVI.* The sufficiency of the Ordinal of Edward, like the validity of the Anglican Ordinations, is independent of the contests on the nature of the Eucharistic Sacrifice. The Church has never defined in what consisted the idea of this Sacrifice. If the Author of the Dissertation entered into this inquiry, it was only in order to clear up the subject, and not to assure to the Ordinations their validity. 439.

“ *Chap. XVII.* The Church has always recognized a Sacrifice in the Eucharist, and the Anglican Church does not condemn it in her 31st Article. 459.

“ *Chap. XVIII.* It is but a question of names to determine whether the Eucharist ought to be called a *proper* Sacrifice; and it is by the idea which is attached to the word *proper*, that we must judge of what the Catholics and the Anglicans admit or reject. 480.

“ *Chap. XIX.* Bad faith of the authors of the Censures in the imputations they have made against me, of having excluded the presence of Jesus Christ from the Eucharistic Sacrifice. 499.

“ *Chap. XX.* The presence of Jesus Christ, although always supposed in the Eucharist, is not what forms the idea of the Eucharistic Sacrifice. 521.

“ *CHAP. XXI.* It is not on the presence of Jesus Christ that the Fathers establish the idea of the Eucharistic Sacrifice. Wrong use which the theologians of the Cardinal de Noailles make of the passages of the Fathers. 540.

“ *CHAP. XXII.* Justification of the Author in the citation of the Theologians whom he has adduced in favour of his opinion of the Sacrifice. 563.

“ *CHAP. XXIII.* Reflections on the manner in which Father Le Quien seeks to elude different facts, and in which he proposes several (*plusieurs*) others. We see throughout nothing but prejudice or want of sincerity. 595.

“ [Advertisement to the Documents which follow. 627.]

“ *RECORD* of the delivering of the spiritualities of the Diocese of Chichester made to Curteys. [It is the Order of Parker to that effect, dated Ap. 29. 1570.] 629.

“ *RECORD* of the Consecration of the same Bishop [May 21. 1570]. [It includes at the beginning the Order of Parker to that effect.]

631 [—637].”^d

To all which is added a leaf of Errata.

^d The object of this latter document is to shew by example that the circumstantiality of the Record of Parker's Consecration is no sufficient ground for suspecting

its authenticity; of the former, that there is no difficulty in Parker's having exercised acts of jurisdiction before the date of his Consecration.

Le Quien, if disposed to reply further, did not live to do it. He died March 12. 1733, aged 72; and thus ended, for the time, this memorable controversy.

Long, however, before this period, the incidental controversy with respect to the doctrine of the Sacrifice, of the commencement of which some account has already been given (see p. xxxviii note *z*), had assumed an importance which had thrown into the shade the original one of the Anglican Orders, and been attended with consequences of the most serious and lasting character to our author himself. As this controversy, however, is foreign to our present purpose, it will be sufficient to notice it very briefly.

Subsequently to what has already been mentioned (see the above note) as having taken place, in order to satisfy the minds of those who doubted of his orthodoxy, our author wrote, Mar. 11. 1727, a Letter to the Cardinal de Noailles, Archbishop of Paris, with which, as he tells us, his Eminence testified his satisfaction to the Superior of his (our author's) Order (see p. 1, note *c*). Also another letter, dated Mar. 15. 1727, to M. l' Abbé Girardin, Doctor of the Sorbonne: compare p. xvi, and p. xvii, note *c*. These two Letters are spoken of in the 3d Chapter of the Relation, p. 54, &c., and form, together with an introductory paragraph, the 10th Article (p. 108—123) of the 2d or documentary volume of that Work, the former Letter beginning on p. 109, and the latter occupying pp. 115—123.

Our author's opponents, however, continuing their efforts, succeeded at length in procuring a formal censure of the obnoxious Works by an Assembly of twenty^e Bishops, with the Cardinal de Bissy^f at their head, at the Abbey of St. Germain des Prés, near Paris, Aug. 22. 1727^g; and this measure being followed up by the Cardinal de Noailles and the Court (by the latter of whom the question had been referred to the Assembly), these writings were suppressed by authority, and he himself, though desirous (as he professed) to condemn any unsound senses attributed to them without admitting those senses to be his, avoided further consequences only by making his escape into England in the latter part (see p. xlvii) of January 1728.^h

^e So our author himself, Rel. vol. 1, p. 173, 174, 178, 285, 290. According to the Biographie Universelle, "Twenty-two Prelates, at the head of whom was the Cardinal de Bissy, assembled at Paris by order of the King, at St. Germain des Prés, Aug. 22. 1727, censured the Dissertation of Father Le Courayer and the Defence of this Dissertation, in which many other questions had been treated of"; thirty-two articles in particular being condemned.

^f Henry de Thiard, son of Claude de Thiard, Count of Bissy, and a distinguished

Officer of Louis XIV. He was born in 1657, made Bp of Toul in 1687, of Meaux in 1704, Cardinal in 1715, and died in 1737.

^g The Abp of Sens, and the Bishops of St. Pons, Avranches, Chalons, and Le Puy endeavoured to soften this sentence. Rel. vol. 1, p. 131.

^h To this step he had been encouraged by the friendly assurances contained in the letters of Abp Wake (see p. xvii, xviii, note *c*). In one of these letters (compare the Anecdotes of Bowyer, p. 84: also p. v. note *e* of this Introd.), dated Dec. 7. 1726, the Abp

The details of the various steps taken by his adversaries and himself in this difficult and painful business, occupy the greater part of the "Relation &c." so often already referred to, and form altogether a very interesting and instructive history¹.

It is a fact, however, worthy of particular notice, that as the question of the doctrinal statements of Courayer had no necessary connection with that of the Anglican Orders, so in condemning the former the Cardinal de Noailles professed distinctly that he pronounced no opinion as to the validity of the latter. This we learn distinctly from his own Mandate of Aug. 18. 1727 (see note *i*), translated, after an introductory paragraph, in the Historical Register for 1729 (vol. xiv), p. 37—39; and followed, after mention (p. 39, 40) of the

notices an observation of our author's with respect to England's not being a very desirable residence for a religious man, "because of the unhappy differences of religion, by which mutual charity is destroyed, and the liberty which many take of speaking against the doctrines of Christianity, and corrupting the minds of the people." (Anecd. of Bowyer as above.) In reply the Abp, amongst other matter, gives an interesting account of his own "almost monastic" manner of life (he being then nearly in his 70th year), together with the ways of his household. The last letter of the forty-five mentioned in the above note, is dated Jan. 31 (O. S.) 1727⁵.

¹ The most important of its remaining points were, 1. The "Denunciation to the Bishops of France of a book intitled A Defence &c.: by M. Claude le Pelletier: 1727." This Pelletier was, it seems, a discreditable character (see Rel. vol. 1, p. 65—68, and the 11th Article, p. 124—129, of vol. 2), and afterwards undertook the defence of the sentence of St. Germain.—2. The Mandate of the Cardinal de Noailles, which though it did not make its appearance till Sep. 5, was antedated by arrangement (according to our author), Aug. 18, in order to save the Cardinal's dignity, by making it appear to have led the way to the censure of the Bishops, instead of (as in reality) being a consequence which that censure forced against his will upon him. This latter accordingly delayed its appearance till Sep. 10, "and was accompanied", says our author, "by a decree of Council dated the 7th, which, in consequence of the judgment of the Bishops, suppressed my Works, and ordered that they should

"be brought to the Lieutenant of Police to be there torn up." Rel. vol. 1, p. 143, 144; &c.—3. The condemnation of the same Works by the Council of Embrun, Sep. 26. 1727. This Council had been assembled under the Abp of that place (Cardinal de Tencin*) for the condemnation, which took place Aug. 20 the same year, of the Pastoral Letter of Soanen Bp of Senez, one of the Cardinal's Suffragans and a zealous opposer of "the Constitution" (see p. xvi), who also gave the signal for the Appeal against it in 1717. The Bishop, refusing to retract, was subsequently suspended; and died, A.D. 1740, in the Abbey of Chaise-Dieu in Auvergne, to which he was banished by the King.—4. The Pastoral Instruction of the Cardinal de Noailles†, dated Oct. 31, but which did not appear till the 21st or 22d of December. (Ibid. p. 293.) It was the alleged unqualified submission to the Cardinal's judgment concerning his books into which this Instruction interpreted a letter of our author's, dated Oct. 30, which he thought it so necessary to disavow, that he quitted his native country in order to do so in safety.—Other events of note were, the Mandate of the Bishop of Marseilles in April 1727 before, and those of several other Bishops after, the censure of St. Germain. Also a conference at Auteuil on the 29th of Oct., between our author and the Superior of his Order (see p. l, note c), at which he was shewn a copy, nearly the same with that afterwards published, of the intended Pastoral Instruction. Both the Superior and the Duc de Noailles, the Cardinal's nephew, did their best all along, out of friendship for Courayer, to bring about an accommodation.

* This Cardinal,—who at a later period issued a Mandate against our author's translation, with notes, of Father Paul's History of the Council of Trent (see p. xlix),—had been made Abp of Embrun July 2. 1724; having previously been Bp of Grenoble; and eventually, in 1740, became Abp of Lyons.—The noted Madame de Tencin, of whom the infidel D'Alembert was the illegitimate offspring,—by her exposed, but brought up by a poor glazier's wife,—was his sister. *Biographie Universelle*.

† Some account of this Instruction is given in the 14th Chapter of the Relation.

censures of St. Germain and Embrun (see again note *i*), by a translation of our author's Letter of Jan 12. 1728 to the Cardinal de Noailles (with the prefixed Advertisement, p. 40, 41)^k, p. 41—49. The same thing is noticed by our author (Rel. vol. 1, Chap. 14, p. 269, 270) in his Instruction of Oct. 31: see p. xlv, notes *i* and †.

Previously to the time of our author's leaving France, on the 28th of August, 1727, the University of Oxford had conferred on him the degree of Doctor of Divinity, for which he had returned thanks in a Latin letter, dated, "Hennemont, near St. Germain en Laye, Dec. 1. 1727."¹ The diploma of the University, and the letter of thanks form, with an introductory paragraph, the 17th Article (p. 182—188) of the 2d or documentary volume of the Relation: also, as we are told by Nichols (Anecdotes of Bowyer, p. 84 and 544, and Epist. Corresp. of Atterbury, p. 103, 104) in the Present State of the Republic of Letters for June 1727 (vol. I, p. 485)^m. The lateness of his answer he attributes to the difficulties of his position, in which both his whole attention was occupied in warding off the efforts of his enemies, and also the expression of his gratitude was pretty certain to be turned against him.

"Haleanment" near St. Germain en Laye", says the author of the Soci-

^k This Letter was printed (with the Advertisement) both in French and in English, separately, by Sam. Jallason, for Peter du Noyer, London 1728. The French (of both) was reprinted by our author in his Relation &c. vol. 2, Art. 23, p. 295—308; the English in the Historical Register as above. We are also referred by Nichols (Epistolary Correspondence of Atterbury, p. 103) to the Political State, vol. 35, p. 147: whether for the English or for the French, or for both, is not said. This letter is dated Jan. 12 (the day our author left Paris), but as it speaks of his intended retreat into England, was left with directions to delay the delivery. Accordingly his Eminence observes in his Pastoral of Feb. 15, that he did not receive it till Jan. 29. Rel., vol. 1, p. 311, 312; and vol. 2, p. 317.

¹ "*Dabam Hannemonte prope S. Germanum in Laya, Kalendis Decembris an. 1727.*" Rel. vol. 2, p. 188. By *Hennemont*,—which the Socinian biographer in the next paragraph writes *Haleanment*, Atterbury in his Epistolary Correspondence (p. 103) *Hanment*,—is meant "the Priory of Hennemont", as our author dates, on the 27th of September, at the end of his explanations of censured propositions, preserved, with a short introduction, as Art. 18, p. 188 (the explanations themselves begin p. 189)—228, of vol. 2 of the Relation. He also dates from Hennemont twice on Sep. 24, *ibid.*

p. 244, 246; but from St. Geneviève Sep. 5, *ibid.* p. 180. On the 30th of Oct. he dates from Auteuil to the Cardinal de Noailles, on Dec. 2 from Nanterre to the same, and on Dec. 4 from St. Germain.

St. Germain en Laye is a town of about 12,000 inhabitants, built on a slope rising from the Seine, 12 miles from Paris. In the environs is the Royal Palace where Louis XIV was born, and James II held his Court after he had lost possession of the British Crown.—*Encycl. Brit.* It is on the left bank.

^m Where there is also, according to the Allgemeine Encyclopædie of 1818, a full Analysis of the present Work.—The publication is in 8vo: Soc. Life, p. xix.

In the Quarterly Review for Dec. 1811 (No. XII, p. 394: see p. lx note *p*, col. 2) will be found the Chancellor's letter, signed "Arran", and dated "Bagshot, Aug. 9, 1727", recommending the University to confer their "highest degree of honour" upon him who had "so well defended the highest order of this Church".—The Reviewer remarks (*ibid.*) that the date of the degree "is earlier than that supposed by Dr. Bell" (see the above note),—whereas Dr. Bell does not mention the date of the degree, but only that of our author's arrival in England, which the Reviewer erroneously assumes to have been earlier, instead of later, than that of the degree.

ⁿ See note *l*.

nian Life already referred to, “ was the place to which our author retreated during the time of his disgrace, where he was visited by Bishop Atterbury, then an exile from his native country”. p. xx. “ This Bishop’s intimacy with Courayer, for whom he acknowledges a friendship, and a parting visit from the Librarian on the evening before he left Paris, occasioned the Prelate some trouble, and produced an unwelcome message to him from the French King and the Cardinal de Noailles [read Cardinal Fleury^o], by the *Lieutenant de Police* [M. Herault.] For the particulars and the issue of this message, the curious are referred to Atterbury’s ‘ Epistolary Correspondence, with historical notes, &c.’ vol. iv, p. 97—116 inclusive, 8vo. 1787.” Ibid. p. xxi.—The affair is mentioned in Feb. 1728, p. 97, 98, p. 102—104, p. 106, p. 107, 108, and p. 109—113 (where we have the English of a letter of thanks sent both in English in his own and in French in another person’s hand by Atterbury to the Lieutenant, with the Lieutenant’s reply in French); in March 1728, p. 116; in Aug. 1728, p. 133, 134;—from which last place we learn that the Cardinal was not, or did not continue to be, so well satisfied as his message in the Lieutenant’s letter appeared to imply).—It is also spoken of by our author himself (Rel. vol. 1, p. 327—329), who however goes no farther than the Lieutenant’s letter, of which as well as the Bishop’s he gives some account.

“ About a month^p, therefore, after the date of his letter to the University of Oxford, in the depth of winter, P.^q Courayer set out on his journey to Calais in a stage coach, to which place he got without suffering any other inconvenience than what he felt from the inclemency of the season, and there he was obliged to remain for [more than^r] three days by contrary winds. It is said, indeed, that he narrowly escaped apprehension in his way^s: he got safe, however, to England, towards the end of January 1727-8^t, where he was embraced with open arms.

“ On his landing at Greenwich, Lord Viscount Perceval, afterwards Earl

^o “ Fleury, then Prime Minister of France”, is the Editor’s note to the words “ the Cardinal” in p. 109 of the same Work and portion to which this biographer refers. Compare p. xx, with note *l*, and p. v, note *e*, of this Introduction.

^p Besides that this is but little consistent with what is said in the latter part of the same paragraph, we learn from our author’s own statement that he left Paris Jan. 12. 1728, i. e. *six weeks* after the date mentioned. See more in note *e*, p. v, and note *k*, p. xlvi.

^q I. e. *Père*, Father.

^r Relation &c. vol. 1, p. 312.

^s He wrote from Calais to the Superior of his Order (see p. 1, note *c*) Jan. 19, to inform him of the step he was taking;—not calculating apparently upon the chances of such delay, and the danger to which he

might in consequence be exposed. Also to the Duc de Noailles for the same purpose, Jan. 20. See these letters, Rel. vol. 2, Art. 22, p. 287—291.—He had previously obtained leave to compensate a disagreeable sojourn of four months at Hennemont (see p. xlvi) by a visit to Senlis, which however the publication of the Cardinal’s Instruction (see p. xlv, note *i*) determined him to abandon, but which fell in opportunely to cover his retreat into England. Rel. vol. 1, p. 309.

^t He reached London Jan. 24, the same day (as he was informed by a letter of Feb. 12) that an order of Council was given for arresting him. This however, as well as other similar measures, appear to have been intended rather to mark displeasure and alarm others than with their ostensible object. (See Rel. vol. 1, p. 325 &c.)

“ of Egmont, sent his coach with six horses to convey him to his house, “ which he desired the Doctor to consider, and to use, as his own : after “ dinner his Lordship made him a handsome present. Next day Dr. Wake, “ then Archbishop of Canterbury, had him to dine at his palace at Lambeth, and made him a like present. Bishop Hare, Bishop Sherlock, and “ several other Prelates, treated him with similar generosity ; and soon “ after his arrival, the Marquis of Blandford made him a present of fifty “ pounds, through the hands of Nicholas Mann, Esq., afterwards Master of “ the Charter-house.” Ibid. p. xxiv, xxv.

“ It is pleasing to be able to say, with certainty, to the honour of this “ nation, that very many of the tables and houses of the great, were generously opened for the reception of P. Courayer, from the first moment of “ his arrival in England. He secured his future constant welcome by his “ own merits, and an instructive, entertaining, and inoffensive manner of “ conversation.

“ He got early into the habit of living, for months together, in one or “ other of the first families in this kingdom ; and at the different habitations of the Countess of Hertford, afterwards Duchess of Somerset, it “ was not unusual for him to make visits of six months at a time.”

“ He did not, however, continue very long a precarious pensioner on the “ bounty of our nobility, prelates, and gentry, who were not deficient in “ their generosity and attention to him. A national pension of 100l. per “ annum was settled upon him.” In 1736^x this pension was doubled by

^u An amusing version of this appears in the *Nouveau Dict. Hist.* : “ Two noblemen “ gave him the use of their tables and “ houses, one in the summer, and the other “ in the winter.”

^v It was obtained “ with some difficulty”, according to the *Anecdotes of Bowyer*, p. 84. Compare a letter of Atterbury’s, in which he speaks of the policy of the English towards the French Court; *Epist. Corresp.* vol. 4, p. 133, 134.

^x Previously to this time, viz. July 11, 1733, which that year was the last day of Trinity or Act Term, we find him at Oxford, delivering in the Theatre a Latin Oration, which was afterwards published with the title “*Oratio habita in Theatro Sheldoniano a P. F. Courayer, S.T.P., Quinto Id. Julii MDCCXXXIII.*” (*An Oration delivered in the Sheldonian Theatre at Oxford by P. F. Courayer, D.D., July 11, 1733.*) In 4to, 9 pages, besides the title. The Socinian biographer (p. lxii) refers to this Oration as containing (p. 5 and 6) “some very “ acrimonious passages”, shewing in his “ opinion that, as Dr. Clarke said of Abp “ Wake on his promotion to the See of “ Canterbury, P. Courayer, with all his “ moderation, was ‘ Priest enough for the

“ ‘place’”, of a Bishop in the Anglican Church: see p. lii of this *Intro.*—There are five copies in the Bodleian, four in the General, and one,—printed by Bowyer (see p. 83 of Nichols’s *Anecdotes of that printer*, 4to, 1782) together with some verses of his own recited at the same Act,—in the Gough Collection, in which is preserved also a translation of it “by a Gentleman of the “ University of Oxford” printed in 8vo the following year. From vol. 2, p. 39 of the same Mr Nichols’s *Literary Anecdotes of the Eighteenth Century*, 1812, into which the former *Anecdotes* were incorporated, we gather that our author “was sneered at in “ a pamphlet of eight pages,” signed with his name, and containing two caricatures of him, in a white dress, with a bell in his hand. This pamphlet might perhaps have been supposed the same with the Letter (mentioned on the same page) from our author to “the Reverend William Whiston, “ in answer to his Letter concerning the “ holy Order of the *Tertulianites* in Asia “ Minor, being Father Courayer’s first “ Essay in the English tongue. To which “ is prefixed, a sketch of the habit of the “ *Tertulianites*, which the curious will “ not be sorry to see”, published in 1728,

“ Queen Caroline, a munificent patroness of men of letters, and of indigent merit. To her he dedicated his French translation of ‘Father Paul’s History of the Council of Trent’, published in that year^y; and his dedication is penned in elegant strains of lively and heartfelt gratitude.

“ By the sale of the translation just mentioned, he cleared, it is said, 1500*l.*, and was enabled to give 1600*l.* to Lord Feversham for an annuity of 100*l.*, which he enjoyed for almost forty years.

“ P. Courayer, after his coming into this country, was never in want of anything that was necessary for him, or that could contribute to the comfort of his life, which he protracted to the very advanced age of ninety-five years. By degrees, and in no great length of time, he got into very affluent circumstances, and was in the receipt of very much more money yearly than his frugal mode of living required.

“ He did not, however, hoard up the overplus of his annual income, or suffer his studious savings to accumulate. His dress, though always remarkably neat, was not costly; not even when he appeared in the habit of a layman, and wore a sword, which he sometimes did, it is said, very awkwardly. He kept no house, he was in no one article of living expensive, and the indigent partook very freely in his good fortune.

instead of a distinct publication in 1733, had not the Index, revised by Nichols himself, treated them as distinct.

It may be added here that Ol. Kiærning, who published at Helmstadt in 1739 a Dissertation concerning the Ordinations of the Anglican Bishops, had enjoyed the advantage both of epistolary correspondence and also of conversations in England with our author, who however made some corrections in the *Nouveau Bibliothèque*, vol. VII, p. 341.—*Allgemeine Encyklopædie of Leipsic* 1818, compared with Maclaine, App. III, p. 118 (see note c, p. xvii, xviii).

^y “ A French Translation of Father Paul’s [Italian] History of the Council of Trent, with notes critical, historical, and theological, 1736, London, 2 volumes in folio; printed at Amsterdam in the same year in two volumes 4to, and at Trevoux, under the title of Amsterdam in 3 volumes in 4to, with a Defence of the Translation by the Author of it.” *Socinian Life*, p. lxxvi.—This Defence (“Defence de la nouvelle &c.” *Defence of the new Translation of the History of the Council of Trent, &c.*) was printed separately at Amsterdam, in 1742, in one 12mo vol. of 462 pages, besides a Preface of xxiv pages, &c. The Translation itself had been prohibited

at Rome: Cardinal Tencin (see p. xlv, notes i and *) and the Bp of Auxerre had also issued Mandates against it.*

“ This Translation is very superior to that of the same Work by Amelot de la Houssaie.” *Nouveau Dict. Hist.* of 1786.—The same authority observes that “the reading of the Treatise *De Republicâ Ecclesiasticâ* [On the Church Commonwealth] of the celebrated Antony de Dominis had led astray the Canon of St. Geneviève”; pointing out at the same time a remarkable similarity in their lives, viz. that both fled to England, where the one edited, the other translated the History of Father Paul.

Of this same History Dr. Johnson commenced in 1738 a new English version, accompanied by a translation of our author’s notes;—which however was afterwards discontinued, and the six sheets which had been printed destroyed. See Nichols’s *Literary Anecdotes &c.* vol. 2, p. 44, and vol. 5, p. 20 and 28, 29. According however to the *Allgemeine Encyklopædie of Leipsic* 1818 and the *Biographie Universelle* these notes were translated into English as well as Italian and German.—The text had been translated into English by Sir Nath. Brent in 1616:—*Lit. Anecd.* vol. 2, p. 44.

* On the same side we find a Work of the Abbé Gervaise, (see p. xxii) —“L’honneur &c.” *The honour of the Church and of the Sovereign Pontiffs defended against the calumnies and invectives of Father Le Courayer in his History of the Council of Trent*; Nanci, 1742, 2 volumes 12mo. *Biographie Universelle*, Art. Gervaise, Dom François Armand.

“ Poor prisoners were favourite objects of his charitable disposition, and shared very liberally in his bounty. From the first payment of his pension, it was certainly his custom^z, and the writer is well assured, that it was not unusual for him, to pay from fifty to eighty pounds a year at a time^a for their benefit.

“ It is well known, and well attested, that he was wont to restrict his expenditure on himself to a very moderate weekly sum; and all that he could possibly save out of his own allotment, with the remainder of his income, never forgetting his charities, he religiously appropriated to supply the necessities and to add to the comforts of two nun sisters and an elder brother [see p. lv] whom he left behind him in France^b.

“ Money, notwithstanding, grew upon him, and he was rather rich at the time of his death, as appears by his Will, of which it may be proper to say something in the sequel.” Ibid. p. xxvii—xxxii.

Soon after his arrival in London he applied, as is said, to a Roman Catholic Priest to hear his confession; but the Priest, “ finding him excommunicated, or on the point of excommunication”^c, declined doing so, “ and earnestly recommended to the Doctor an immediate application to his rightful Superior at St. Geneviève.” Ibid. p. xxxiii, xxxiv. It is said, however, “ that for many years, and it may be to the end of his life, he applied for confession, in order to absolution, regularly, at stated times”. Ibid. p. xxxvii.

The same biographer informs us that he “ is well warranted to say, that — he always continued to the last, every day, to say, or repeat, his breviary, which was a daily business of more than one hour.”

When in London he attended only the services of the Church of Rome. Ibid. p. xxxviii. “ Nevertheless, at Ealing in Middlesex, a village to which

^z Instead of a comma, we ought apparently to read with a semicolon, supplying the sense from the preceding sentence.

^a Either “ a year” or “ at a time”,—more probably the former,—ought, as it would seem, to be omitted.

^b “ He was occasionally generous to some of his relations in France” is the expression in the Anecdotes of Bowyer. The Socinian biographer, however, was in possession of some original information, see note *h*, p. vi, vii:—yet that his statement is at least somewhat overcharged, his own following paragraph implies.

^c Elsewhere (p. lii) this biographer says that “ it does not certainly appear that he was ever actually excommunicated” from the Roman Catholic Communion. He

was declared, however, to have incurred the greater excommunication, by his Superior Fr. de Riberolles, Abbot of St. Geneviève, and Chief and Superior General of the Canons Regular of the Congregation of France, assisted by the Prior and others, Jan. 30, 1728.* The sentence, preceded by the Abbot’s circular letter (dated Feb. 1), and an introductory paragraph, forms the 25th Article, p. 322—333, of the 2nd or documentary volume of the “Relation &c.” A reprinted letter of our author’s to the Abbot, dated Mar. 15. 1728, commenting on this sentence, forms with an introductory paragraph the last Article, p. 333—346, of the same volume; in which are contained also a variety of other letters relating to both controversies.

* The *Nouveau Dict. Hist. of 1786* appears to suppose that this excommunication itself, the Socinian biographer (p. xxii) that at least a direct threat of it, preceded and caused our author’s departure. Both suppositions are wrong.

“ P. Courayer often withdrew [“ for privacy”^d], at Percy-lodge, &c. he constantly attended the parish-church, and he always expressed great satisfaction in the prayers of the Church of England.” Ibid. p. xxxix.

The following extract, given in the Anecdotes of Bowyer, p. 544, from a letter of Mr. Jeremiah Markland to Mr. Bowyer, dated Sep. 29. 1746, records the opinion of the former scholar with respect to our author’s sentiments at the time of his publishing his translation of Father Paul’s History of the Council of Trent, *i. e.* ten years sooner :

“ Mr. Clarke has given me Father Courayer’s Translation of the History of the Council of Trent^e, with whose Preface I am so greatly pleased (having just read it), that if he be no more a Papist in other tenets, than he is in those he mentions, (which are many, and of the most distinguished class,) I dare say, there are very few considerate Protestants who are not as good Catholics as he is. If you have not read it, you have a great pleasure to come.”

Of the same character appears to have been a Work which he published at Amsterdam in 1744, intitled : “ Examen des défautes &c.,” “ *An Examination of the defects of theology, wherein is pointed out the means of reforming them.*” In two volumes 12mo. In this Work, which was not known till long after to be his, and of which an analysis may be seen in Stæudlin’s History of Theological Science, vol. 2, p. 349, “ his object was to deliver theology from its barbarism, and make it more serviceable to religion”. *Allgemeine Encyclopædie of Leipsic* 1818.

Dr. Warburton’s opinion of our author’s writings may be seen in an extract from a letter dated May 11. 1741, preserved in Nichols’s Literary Anecdotes, vol. 5, p. 572.^f

With respect to the English in general, Voltaire (Age of Louis XIV, vol. 2. p. 371, 372, Eng. Trans. Ed. 8vo, 1752,—as quoted by the new Biog. Brit.), after mentioning Le Quien’s reply to Courayer, adds : “ But the English pay no more regard to these disputes than the Turks do to dissertations upon the Greek Church.” That many, however, of the Anglican Clergy and others of that day thought differently, is shewn, as this biographer justly observes, by their conduct towards our author.

The Encyclopédie Méthodique quotes from Voltaire another passage relating to our author, in which he says of the Whigs, that “ they are

^d Anecdotes of Bowyer p. 85.

^e “ This copy of Courayer’s book was given to Mr. Clarke by Bishop Hare.”—*Socinian Life*, p. 1. So also the Lit. Anecd. vol. 2, p. 44.

^f This extract is as follows :—“ One of the most remarkable effects of the wise project of an union with the Gallican Church, was Courayer’s writings and banishment. However he has got more

“ by coming here than he could have got in peace at home ; and much more by writing for our Ordination than he would have got by writing for our Faith. But, to be sure, he deserves it all, by so much endeavouring in all his writings, to give us a good opinion of moderate French Popery ; a security I suppose against our falling in love with the worst kind of Popery, the English.”

“even better pleased that the Bishops draw their authority from the Parliament than from the Apostles.”

In 1749 we find our author present at the institution of the Rev. William Cole to the Rectory of Hornsey in Middlesex. Lit. Anecd. vol. 1, p. 658.

“It is said indeed, I know not how truly, that P. Courayer was offered and refused preferment,—a Bishopric, as I have heard,—in the Church of England.” Socinian Life, p. lxii. Compare p. xlvi. note *x* of this Introduction.

With the Princess Amelia, daughter of George II, “and her sister Caroline [Elizabeth-Caroline], it was a rule with P. Courayer, when in London, to spend always one evening in the week. Their Royal Father was often, it is said, of their party; which must have been equally instructive and entertaining; for the Doctor was a cheerful man, and a lover and promoter of innocent mirth.

“In this little circle, contrary to the usual custom of Courts, P. Courayer was probably most open and communicative. Supposing, no doubt, that it best became his situation and circumstances in this country, he generally practised more reserve on religious subjects than appeared to have been natural to him; studiously declining in common conversation the free communication of his thoughts on every topic that led to controversy.” Ibid. p. xlvi, xlvi.

We are told also that, “according to the concurring testimonies of several very credible witnesses, who knew him well, and were very much in his company, he had — a considerable degree of natural timidity, which dictated to him a cautiousness of conversation”, although not such as to exceed the due bounds of circumspection”. Ibid. p. xlvi, xlvi.

According to the same authority (p. lii—liv)^g, a message was sent him about the end of the year 1763, from the Superior of his Order at St. Geneviève, by a relation of the Superior's, “that all his enemies were then dead, and that, if he would resume his former station, he would be

^g The biographer's own words are:—
“It is very certain, that long after his coming here, even in the year 1763, he was, at least intentionally, re-invited to the country from which he came on the point of excommunication. [See note *c.*]

“This is vouched as a fact, on the personal information of a gentleman of eminent knowledge, and unquestionable veracity. The writer is not left at liberty to mention the name of his informer; but he is the very person who brought a message to P. Courayer, from the Superior of his Order at St. Geneviève, to the following purpose, and given, so far as the writer can remember, in the very words of the Protestant messenger, who was that Superior's relation.

“About the end of 1763, I had it in charge, from the Superior of his Order at St. Geneviève, who was my relation, to call on Dr. Courayer, and to assure him, that all his enemies were then dead, and that, if he would resume his former station, he would be received with open arms, without recantation, or any submission whatsoever.’ On my learned and worthy informer's return to London, P. Courayer was at Windsor, where he continued for some time; and it so happened, that the gentleman here referred to, never delivered this message, nor it is affirmed from his own knowledge, that the same, or any similar message, was ever delivered to the Doctor by any other messenger.”

“received with open arms, without recantation, or any submission what-ever.” Courayer however being at Windsor, and continuing there for some time, it so happened that the messenger referred to (who was the Socinian biographer’s informant) never delivered his message; nor is it certain that it was ever delivered at all.

At the same date a note in the old *Biog. Brit.* (1747—1766),—see p. xvii, xviii, note c,—says: “He is now [1763] (*sic*) four score and three [it should be *two*] years of age, and in a good state of health.” P. 4095.

A few years later he published a French Translation, with notes^h, of Sleidan’s Latin History of the Reformation,—printed at the Hague, 1767—1769ⁱ, in 3 volumes 4to, and subsequently translated into German.—Concerning our author’s own Translation see more, p. liv, and p. lvi, note u.

Between the Jesuits and our author there had always been the strongest opposition; “yet his humanity was excited on the suppression of their Order in 1773; and he lamented exceedingly the hardships of many men, rendered by this event perfectly destitute.

“He could never be brought to think, favourably of Archibald Bower^k, author of the compilation called ‘Lives of the Popes’; but always insisted from the beginning of his acquaintance with him, that he was a dark man, of a suspicious character, who pretended to have collected from books which he certainly had never seen. The detection, for which the publick was indebted to the ingenuity and laudable pains of Dr. Douglas [Bishop of Salisbury], verified P. Courayer’s suspicions.” *Ibid.* p. xxxii, xxxiii.

“P. Courayer, whether Papist or Protestant, was by all accounts a Christian of the true breed, who retained to the last of a long life the regard and esteem of all good men. The current of testimonies runs strong and clear in favour of his character: he was well known, and generally believed to be true and a friend to truth. His conversation, it is said, was peculiarly edifying and pleasing, enlivened with much variety of literary and historical anecdotes; his manners were pure, unsuspecting, and unsuspected; and with all his politure, he never lost his sterling simplicity.”¹ *Ibid.* p. lxxiii, lxxiv.

“P. Courayer’s sight was very bad for many years, and for the two or three last of his life he was entirely blind. In his life-time, it may be

^h “This Work is accompanied with copious notes, wherein the author discusses interesting facts.”—*Nouveau Dict. Hist.* of 1786; which observes further, that, though the author is not always impartial, “he is yet more moderate in this than in his other writings.”

ⁱ So the *Allgemeine Encyklopædie* of Leipsic 1818; rightly. Others less accurately, 1767; the *Biographie Universelle*, “1767 and 1769”.

^k A Jesuit who renounced the Church of Rome; concerning whose very shocking history and ultimate disgrace see Chalmers’s *New Biog. Dict.*

¹ “Although he had a very sharp tone in his Works, he was in society agreeable and polite; his morals were pure; his conversation was instructive, and mingled with a great number of literary and historical anecdotes.” *Nouveau Dict. Hist.* of 1786.

“ about twenty years before he died, he gave his books to Archbishop Tenison's Library at St. Martin's.” *Ibid.* p. lxxvii.

He was also nearly deaf, as appears from the following letter, addressed by him to Dr. Ducarel soon after the publication of his translation of Sleidan's History of the Reformation (see p. liii), and preserved in Nichols's Anecdotes of the Eighteenth Century, vol. 9, p. 17 ;—in which same work, vol. 6, p. 380—405, may be seen an account of Dr. Ducarel.

“ Dear Doctor,

May 30, 1769.

“ I thank you for the information you gave me of the reception of my last volume of Sleidan's Translation. I would have had the honour to present it myself to his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury [Dr. Cornwallis] ; but, being unknown to him, and being besides almost blind and deaf, I thought more proper to send it directly to the Library, especially after Miss Talbot^m told me that the two first volumes were left there. I will be obliged to you, however, if you be so good to present my respects to his Grace, and assure him, that, if it was not for my old age, and my deafness, I would be very glad to pay him my respects in person. I make use at the same time of this opportunity to remind you of our old acquaintance : and to assure you that I am, as much as ever, dear Doctor, Your obedient servant,

Pet. Fr. Le Courayer.”

The above is the only specimen the present Editor remembers to have seen of our author's English composition.

“ P. Courayer died”, continues the Socinian biographer, “ at his lodgings in Spring-gardensⁿ, after an illness, it is said, of two days, on the 17th^o of October 1776, at the very advanced age of 95 ; and was buried, at his own desire, in the cloister of Westminster Abbey, by Dr. Bell, then Chaplain to the Princess Amelia.” P. lxxvii, lxxviii.

“ Dr. Courayer's Will, dated Feb. 3. 1774^p, was proved at Doctors' Commons, Oct. 24. 1776. He left 500*l.* to St. Martin's Parish, to the Library of which he had many years before [see above] given all his

^m Catharine, daughter of the Rev. Edward Talbot, and grand-daughter of Dr. Talbot Bp of Oxford, Salisbury, and Durham. She and her mother formed part of the domestic circle of the preceding Abp, Dr. Secker, who died Aug. 3. 1768, æt. 75. See *Bartlett's Memoirs of Bp Butler*, pp. 23, 246. In the same Work, p. 19, 20, may be seen an anecdote of Mr Talbot's fasting.—The first volume of the translation of Sleidan appeared in 1767.

ⁿ “ He died in Downing Street, Westminster.” *New Biog. Brit.*

^o So too the Anecdotes of Bowyer, the new Biog. Brit., and others: Mr. Kynaston's Epitaph (see p. lvi) gives the 15th: the

French biographers in the *Encyclopédie Méthodique*, the *Nouveau Dict. Hist.*, and the *Biographie Universelle*, the 16th. The 17th is most probably right.

^p In this Will he professed,—“ That he died a Member of the Catholic Church, but without approving of many of the opinions and superstitions which have been introduced into the Romish Church, and taught in their Schools and Seminaries, and which they have insisted on as articles of faith, though to him they appeared to be not only not founded in truth, but also to be highly improbable.” *New Biog. Brit.*

“books. He bequeathed 200*l.* to the Parish of St. Margaret in Westminster, a handsome sum of money to the poor of Vernon in Normandy, where he was born^q, and many legacies to his friends in England. The residue of his estate was left to two nephews of his name at Vernon.” Ibid. p. lxxviii, lxxix. To an elder brother, a lawyer in Paris, *who survived him* (!), he left “a fine gold snuff box, which he had received as a present from Queen Caroline”. (Ibid. p. xxxii.)

“There is, it seems, a small oval portrait of Dr. Courayer, engraved by Mrs. Elizabeth B. [Elizabeth-Bridgetta] Gulston^r from a painting by Hamilton, with this inscription: ‘Pierre François Courayer, who was banished France for writing in defence of [the] English Ordination. He was born at Rouen, Nov. 17. 1681, and is still living. Published June 1. 1774^s.’

“The writer, or writers of the article *Courayer, P. F.*, in the French Dictionary mentioned at the beginning of this account [“the Nouveau Dict. Hist. 8vo., 6 tomes, 1779”: p. vi] likewise make Rouen the place of the Doctor’s nativity, and date his birth in the same year^t.

“Bishop Atterbury had a very fine picture of P. Courayer, which his Lordship made the *Lieutenant de Police* take notice of, when he came to him with an unpleasant message from the French King and the Cardinal de Noailles, as has been before narrated. That identical picture is now in the Bodleian Library (see p. lvii), having been left by the Bishop’s Will to the University of Oxford^u. It is hardly necessary to

^q So too the Anecdotes of Bowyer, both here and at the beginning of the account. It is observable, however, that the author of the life in the new Biog. Brit. (see p. vii, note †), who appears from a note on p. 316 to have inspected the Will himself, omits this clause. Concerning the real place of his birth see farther on.

^r “Mrs. Gulston was the wife of Joseph Gulston, Esq. [M.P.] of Ealing Grove, Middlesex, a celebrated collector of British portraits.” *Nichols’s Literary Anecdotes &c.* vol. 2, p. 44.—This portrait was etched in 1772, *ibid.* vol. 9, p. 605. It is also mentioned in the same author’s *Illustrations &c.* vol. 6, p. 58, and is the same apparently from which the portrait there given, together with our author’s subscription, opposite p. 60, has been copied. Compare p. lvi note x.—It should be added that “the good Doctor was among the intimate and confidential friends of Mr. Gulston during his residence at Ealing.” *Ibid.* p. 61.

^s In the Lit. Anecd. (see note r), misprinted 1744.

^t So also (see p. xv) the fuller account

in the Allgemeine Encyclopædie of Leipsic 1818. That Rouen, not Vernon, was the real place of his birth appears also from the inscription under the picture in the Bodleian (see p. lvii and compare note u.)

^u This, though found also in Nichols’s Epistolary Correspondence of Atterbury, vol. 4, p. 104, is not quite correct, as appears by the following paragraph of one of the interesting letters of the Rev. Charles Godwyn, many years Fellow of Balliol College, to Mr Hutchins, the Historian of Dorsetshire, preserved in a later Work of Nichols’s, *viz.* his *Literary Anecdotes of the Eighteenth Century*, vol. 8, p. 227—260:

“Father Courayer, who wrote a Defence of the English Ordinations in the year 1723, is still living in London, and intended us a visit at this time. Before he left Paris, he had his picture drawn with this inscription under it, ‘Quocumque duxit Veritas, ausus sequi’ [Whithersoever the truth led, he dared to follow], and made a present of it to Bishop Atterbury. The Bishop intended to make a present of it to the University; but, after his death, his intention not

“ add. that it represented P. F. Courayer in the prime and vigour of his life^x.

“ In the cloister of Westminster Abbey, directly over the effigies of Abbot Vitalis, there is an inscription meant to do justice and honour to Dr. Courayer's memory, the production of an ingenious Fellow of Brazen Nose College, the late Mr. Kynaston. That inscription was placed upon the monument too hastily, before the author's requested revisal. A more accurate copy of it Mr. Kynaston gave afterwards to his friend Mr. Nichols, to whom the public is indebted for the ‘Anecdotes of Bowyer’. With a faithful transcript from it, as published in that Work [p. 545], this account, very hastily drawn up, concludes.

“ H. S. E.

ANNIS MORUMQUE INTEGRITATE JUXTA REVERENDUS
 PETRUS FRANCISCUS COURAYER,
 CŒNOBII DE SANCTA GENOVEVA DICTI
 APUD URBEM LUTETIAM PARISIORUM
 REGULARIS OLIM CANONICUS.
 VIR, SI QUIS ALIUS,
 DE ECCLESIA ATQUE POLITIA ANGLICANA
 ANIMO PARITER AC SCRIPTIS
 OPTIME MERITUS.
 QUIPPE QUI EPISCOPALIUM JUS ADMINISTRATIONUM,
 JAMDIU A PONTIFICIIS ACERRIME IMPUGNATUM,
 HUIC EIDEM ECCLESIAE,
 ET GALLUS IPSE ET PONTIFICIUS,
 INVICTA ARGUMENTORUM VI ASSERTUIT ET VINDICAVIT:
 QUIQUE ADEO, OB ID VINDICANDUM,
 PULSUS JAM PATRIA, PROFUGUS,
 OMNIBUSQUE DEMUM EXUTUS FORTUNIS,
 HAC IN URBE QUÆREBAT ASYLUM, ET INVENIEBAT;
 IBIQUE PER ANNOS PROPE QUINQUAGINTA
 HONESTÆ MENTIS OTIO EGREGIUS FRUEBATUR EXUL,
 BONORUM OMNIUM DELICIAE VIVUS,
 MORIENS COMMUNE DESIDERIUM.
 OBIIT QUINTA DECIMA^y DIE OCTOBRIS
 ANNO POST NATUM CHRISTUM MDCCLXXVI,
 POST SE NATUM XCV.
 HUIC TALI TANTOQUE VIRO,

“ being known, it went into other hands, and lately Father Courayer got possession of it himself. He has now sent it hither with a very complaisant letter, and intends very soon to make us a present of a translation which he has made in French of Sleidan's ‘History of the Reformation’. We met on Friday, and consented to put the University seal to a letter expressing our thanks to him for his good disposition towards this place.” P. 257.—This letter is dated *Balliol Col-*

lege, Nov. 27. 1768.

In another of Mar. 12. 1769 Mr Godwyn writes to the same gentleman:—“ Father Courayer has translated Sleidan's ‘History of the Reformation’, and added notes to it. It makes three volumes in quarto. I promise myself great pleasure in reading it.” P. 258.

^x That of Hamilton (see p. lv) represents him, of course, at a very advanced age.

^y Concerning this date see note q.

MARMOR HOC, AMORIS SUI MONUMENTUM,
 POSUERE AMICI;
 CUI FAMAM MARMORE PERENNIOREM PEPERIT
 DEFENSA VERITAS, REFUTATUS ERROR.”^z

Ibid. p. lxxx—lxxxiv.

The inscription under the picture in the Bodleian (see above) is as follows:—

PET. FRANC. LE COURAYER S. GENOVEFÆ PARIS. CANONICUS
 REGUL. ET BIBLIOT^s. NATUS ROTHOMAGI 17^o NOV. AN. 1681.
 QUOCUMQUE DUXIT VERITAS, AUSUS SEQUI.^a

The Doctor was of a small figure, as appears from some familiar and interesting extracts of letters “from the elegant and lively pen of Mrs. “Montagu”^b, preserved, with an addition (p. 63) “on the authority of a “friend in whose family he passed much of his time at Ealing^c”, in Nichols’s *Illustrations of the Literary History of the Eighteenth Century*, vol. 5^d, p. 60^e—63. In one of these extracts, taken from a letter to the Duchess of Portland, dated Sandford, (p. 61,) this lady speaks of his appearance after getting there from Oxford “through a whole day’s rain”. A few days before, she had taken him “to see Mr. Sloper’s gardens and house at a time “when” she “was assured he was absent on his election”. In this letter she adds: “Mrs. Donnellan and Dr. Courayer join in desiring their best “respects and compliments to your Grace.” In another letter, to Mrs Donnellan herself, (p. 62,) “descriptive of a tour” on which our author was

^z Of this very classical Epitaph the following is a very literal translation:

“Here lies buried,—venerable alike for
 “his years and the integrity of his life,—
 “Peter Francis Courayer,—of the Abbey of
 “St. Geneviève,—in the City of Paris,—
 “formerly a Canon Regular.—A man, if any
 “ever was,—towards the Anglican Church
 “and Polity,—equally by his mind and his
 “writings,—of the highest deserving.—
 “Who indeed the right of the Episcopal
 “Administrations,—long by the Papists most
 “fiercely attacked,—to this same Church,—
 “a Frenchman and a Papist himself,—by
 “an invincible force of arguments asserted
 “and vindicated:—And who therefore, on
 “account of the vindication of this,—from his
 “country thenceforth expelled, a wanderer,—
 “and stripped in short of all his fortunes,—
 “in this City sought an asylum, and found
 “it;—and there for well nigh fifty years—
 “enjoyed the rest of a noble mind, an illus-
 “trious exile;—alive, the delight of all the
 “good,—dead, their common regret.—He
 “died the fifteenth day of October—in the
 “year of our Lord 1776,—of his own age
 “95.—To him, such and so great a man,—
 “this marble, a monument of their love,—
 “his friends have placed;—(to him,) for

“whom has acquired a fame more lasting
 “than marble—the defence of truth, the re-
 “futation of error.”—Concerning the date
 of our author’s decease see p. liv, note o.

^a “Peter Francis Le Courayer, Canon
 “Regular and Librarian of St. Geneviève
 “at Paris, born at Rouen, Nov. 17. 1681.
 “Whithersoever the truth led, he dared to
 “follow.”

^b In whose letters “the name of Dr. C.
 “is frequently introduced”. *Illustrations*
 &c. p. 61. In the extracts given she calls
 him “the little Père” (Father), “the little
 “Doctor”, and “the little Philosopher”;
 and after the *soaking* mentioned in the
 text, speaks of ‘his small boots sticking to
 ‘his small legs’.

^c “He lost his temper at cards; and
 “then he used to say, in his broken Eng-
 “lish, ‘It is not for *de gain*, but for *de con-*
 “‘quest.’”

^d Volumes 5 and 6, published in 1828
 and 1831, were posthumous. The pre-
 ceding volumes were published in 1817,
 1817, 1818, and 1822.

^e Opposite this page is given a portrait
 (copied, apparently, from Mrs Gulston’s
 print: see p. lv and lvi, with notes r and x),
 together with his subscription.

evidently of the party, and written subsequently to the letter of 1745 mentioned below, she speaks of dining with him at Salisbury with the Bishop and Mrs. Sherlock; which and other civilities, "we were entitled to", says she, "only on account of our being friends of Dr. Courayer." At the Bishop's, he met unexpectedly "an old friend and a new Peer", Lord Feversham, then resident at Downton, Wilts. In the same letter she also mentions him in Lord Hertford's garden at Marlborough^f, to which place they came from Amesbury.^g In another, to Gilbert West, Esq., dated Oct. 31. 1751, she humourously describes a visit she paid him at his lodgings in London, when "ill of a sore throat".^h P. 62, 63.—In another, to the Duchess of Portland, she says:—"he looks well, and his mind always seems to be the seat of tranquillity." P. 61. In another, to the same Duchess, in 1745, she writes of our author ("whom her husband had then recently met at Dunstable, travelling with Mr Stanhope"):"He has all the virtues, and "almost as much innocence, as would qualify a man for Paradise, and to "walk with angels like our first parents."

Such was the life, and such, so far as appeared to the public during his life, were the doctrinal views, of Courayer: it is melancholy to be obliged to add, that it subsequently came to light, by means of two posthumous Works (see p. lix), that towards the close, at least, of the long period of his earthly existence, he had fallen into unsound views even on the fundamental doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation.

As to the former, he acquiesced indeed in the language of the Church, of three Persons in one Substance, but attempting to explain this language otherwise than in the received way, he fell apparently into a kind of modified Sabellianism, or, to say the least, into a very near approximation to such a view. As regards the doctrine of the Incarnation, he appears to

^f "With which Dr. Courayer was pleased "as at seeing a sort of acquaintance [see "p. xlviiii], but it has nothing in it to commend it to strangers." *Ibid.*

^g In the same letter she says:—"Dr. Courayer sends his thanks for the ring, "but I fear he will find your advice impracticable; though this morning he had "the douceur to say he was sorry my head "ached." P. 62.—In a preceding letter to the same lady, dated Oct. 10. 1742:—"Tell Dr. Courayer my head is as much "troubled with chimeras and giddiness as "ever. I fear he is too fond of variety in "life to be a friend to matrimony." P. 61.

^h "Poor Dr. Courayer notified to me "that he was ill of a sore throat, and could "not come to visit me, though he wanted "to see me: to make this matter easy, I "went to him. I was obliged to pass "through all the gay vanities of Mrs.

"Chenevix ["the well known toy-shop in "Holborn, afterwards Grosvenor's", adds "the Editor's note], and then ascend a "most steep and difficult staircase, to get "at the little philosopher". After mentioning his "cap of the warmest beaver, "made still more respectable by a gold "orris", she adds: "'a wondrous hieroglyphic robe he wore' ["a chintz dressing gown", the Editor's note tells us], "in which was portrayed all the attributes "of the god Fo, with the arms and achievements of the Cham of Tartary. Never "did Christian doctor wear such a Pagan "appearance; one would have imagined "he had been sent hither from Tonquin to "propagate idolatrous worship. . . . He "asked much after your health, and with "so much regard, I am convinced he is "still a good Christian at heart, though his "habit is so heathenish." P. 62, 63.

have adopted a kind of Nestorian idea. It must be observed, however, that he seems to have thought that he agreed in substance with the Catholic and Orthodox doctrine, and differed only from the "common" or received way of explaining it; and that he defended the maintainers of Orthodoxy from the charges made by the Socinians against them.

On the doctrine, too, of original sin, his views were very unsound. After some previous remarks on infant-baptism, he adds:

"In saying this, it is not my intention to censure the practice, so ancient and so general, of baptizing infants; but I would not therefore regard as in error those who believe baptism to be necessary to adults only; for though I believe, as St. Paul teaches, that *it was by the first man that sin entered into the world, and death by sin*ⁱ, I cannot easily conceive that by this sin it is necessary to understand a personal guilt in every infant, in consequence of which, before he can make use of his will and liberty, he deserves to be punished as for a voluntary fault, which renders him not merely subject to miseries and infirmities, but moreover liable to an everlasting damnation." Latest Opinions (see below), § 28, p. 32, 33^k.

With respect, too, to the Atonement, there is in both these Treatises a silence which, particularly when taken in connection with the Pelagian views just mentioned, is by no means satisfactory. He defends, however, the doctrine of a commemorative Sacrifice in the Mass. Ibid. § 32, p. 35^l.

In other respects, whilst he finds fault with the lengths to which professed Protestants have gone, he yet follows freely his own judgment in dissenting from, or doubting the correctness of, a large proportion of the doctrine and discipline maintained by the Church of Rome.

The two posthumous Works to which reference has been made are, 1. his "Déclaration des mes Derniers Sentiments &c.", *Declaration of my Latest Opinions on the Different Doctrines of Religion*, dated March 25. 1767; and 2. his "Traité où l'on expose &c.", *A Treatise setting forth what the Scripture teaches us of the Divinity of Jesus Christ*; of both which the Manuscripts were given by their author himself to the Princess Amelia, daughter of George II, with a request "that, if they were made public, it might not be till after his own death"^m; and by her bequeathed (or givenⁿ) to her Chaplain, Dr. William Bell, Prebendary of Westminster; by whom they

ⁱ "Rom. v. 12." The italics are in the French, but the reader will observe that the quotation is not in the exact words of Scripture.

^k In the Socinian Translation (see p. lxi), which in the passages here quoted has been carefully corrected by the present Editor), p. 70, 71.

^l In the Soc. Tr. (see note k), p. 74—76.

^m Editor's Advertisement to the latter Work.

ⁿ Of the Manuscript of the *Déclaration*

Dr Bell says in his Advertisement, that her Royal Highness "left it" him "by legacy"; of that of the *Traité* &c., the Advertisement to which is dated more than 23 years later (see p. lxi), that she gave it him at the same time with that of the *Déclaration*. Considering however the distinctness of the former expression, used more than 23 years nearer the time, one may reasonably suppose that the latter is either to be understood in the same sense, or to be attributed to a slip of memory.

were published,—the former in 1787, with a French Advertisement, bearing date April 4^o of the same year,—the latter not till 1811, the Advertisement however, which is in English, being dated Aug. 30. 1810.

“A strong dislike”, says this Dignitary in the latter Advertisement, “to be the Editor of a controversial Work, upon the subject of that now before us above all others, in which the doctrine concluded upon is very widely different from that adopted by the Church of England, was the real cause of my not publishing the present Treatise immediately after the former Tract.

“That dislike still continues. But I am not able to satisfy my own mind, that it would not be an act of highly blameable presumption in me finally to suppress a Work of so very respectable an author, which, it is manifest, he took particular care to preserve, and plainly signified his consent to its being published after his own decease.”

Besides this, he was influenced also by the further consideration, that there was in other hands an imperfect copy, which, if he suppressed his Manuscript, might very probably be printed after his death.^p

In the Advertisement to the former Work, the same Dignitary speaks of its author's having “been so happy as to liberate himself almost entirely from the pernicious influence of the prejudices of his education with respect to the erroneous opinions of the Church of Rome, and her absurd and insupportable institutions” (p. iv)^q,—excusing at the same time what still remained,—but drops no word of regret that he should not at least have stopped short of the fearful heresies which have been mentioned above!^r

In this former Work, i. e. his Latest Opinions, after an introductory paragraph, our author treats of—Atheism, Polytheism, the Unity of the Godhead, the Trinity, the Incarnation, the immortality of the soul, the future state, purgatory, the duration of punishment, the resurrection of the body, predestination and free-agency, the origin of evil both moral and

^o In the Soc. Tr. (see note *k*), incorrectly, “April 14”.

^p With respect to the publication of this latter Work, Chalmers, in his new Edition (A.D. 1812—1817*) of the London Biographical Dictionary (see p. vi), observes that “it could not be wanting to illustrate the wavering, unsettled character of the author”;—a remark which as regards our author's supposed character, is altogether ill founded and superficial; there being in fact few instances on record either of so slow and gradual, or of so steady and uniform, a development in one direction:—alas that in him it should have been the direction of Anti-Catholic Rationalism! On the moral, however, of his case see pp. lxi—lxiii. The

The conduct of Dr. Bell in publishing this Work is also censured in an article on the Work itself in the Quarterly Review for Dec. 1811 (No. XII, p. 391—405),—defended (in answer to the Reviewer) in a letter in the Gentleman's Magazine, Vol. LXXXII, Part I, p. 620—622.

^q In the Soc. Tr. (see note *k*), p. 6, 7.

^r The Socinian translation (p. 1) makes him speak also of this Declaration as “now happily brought to light”; but on looking to the original (p. i) the reader will find only “qui voit enfin le jour” (“which sees at last the day”). Is this the “religious fidelity” of which the translator's Advertisement (p. iii, iv) makes so great a profession?

* The volume containing the Art. *Courayer* is dated 1813.

physical, original sin, the Bible, the deutero-canonical books, inspiration, General Councils, the infallibility of the Church, that of the Pope, Episcopacy, the number of the Sacraments, justification, merit, Baptism, infant-baptism, transubstantiation, the Eucharistic Sacrifice, Communion in one kind only, Confession, satisfactions, indulgences, images, relics, invocation of Saints, Divine Service in a foreign language, “the laws concerning fasts, the distinction of meats, the feasts, and other similar practices,” the celibacy of Ecclesiastics, vows of continence and religion, and finally, persecution. His conclusion he ends as follows: “If I have been deceived, it has been in good faith; and I hope that God, in His mercy, will pardon me involuntary errors, and grant me in the other life, the light which shall have been refused me in this. *Pierre François Le Courayer. London, March 25. 1767.*” P. 59^s.

This Work was translated the same year^t by a Socinian (see p. v, note c)^u, who in the prefixed Life of our author from which the preceding copious extracts have been given, though highly praising him in other respects, inveighs in strong language against his wish that his heretical notions should not be made public during his life-time. But the truth is, our author was far from entertaining any strong feeling against the received views; one of his chief faults having in fact been, an inclination to think, that there was less actual disagreement of importance between different views on the Trinity and Incarnation than there appeared to be. He speaks however, in p. 310 of the latter Treatise, of the language of the Socinians with respect to our Saviour contradicting the doctrine of the Gospel, and in p. 311, 312 charges them with many other errors. The Socinian translator, however, wrote twenty-four years before the publication of this latter Treatise.

How far our author’s heresies may have been those of the head rather than of the heart, it is not for man to judge. There seems indeed much in his case to encourage the hope, that the more charitable may be also the truer opinion; but even so,—even under the most favourable construction,—there remains at least an awful warning of the impotence of human reason. If ever there was a man whom both nature and education might seem to have conspired to enable to judge safely, it was Courayer. To a power of mind and clearness of head rarely surpassed, he added a vast extent of systematically arranged Ecclesiastical learning; he had no party interest or blind prejudice to warp his judgment;—on the contrary, the very object of his life appeared to be the discovery of truth;—and with all this were joined

^s In the Soc. Trans. (see note k), p. 121, 122.

^t In the account of Dr Calder in the Lit. Anecd. &c. vol. 9, p. 805 (see note u) the date is given wrongly as 1789; elsewhere in that Work correctly 1787.

^u Dr John Calder, a literary character and originally a Dissenting Minister: see Nichols’s Literary Anecdotes &c. vol. 2, p. 44, 45, and vol. 9, p. 804—806, in which latter place some account is given of him. He died June 10. 1815, aged 82.

both a candour and a practical piety of no common order. His life was unimpeachable; (with reference to controversial matters alone does his conduct appear to have been even called in question;) and not merely so, but it was also adorned in a very high degree,—and that too throughout his long half-century's exile in a position so unfavourable,—with those simple and Christian graces to which the Church has ever attached the highest value. Nor was he by any means the man to maintain paradoxes, an affecter of singularity, or otherwise of a peculiar turn of mind; unless indeed a very uncommon freedom from prejudice and sincere love for the truth, together with that high and straightforward tone of mind, which, in spite of an extensive knowledge of the world, made him above availing himself of its arts and intrigues, might justly intitle him to be considered as such. Nor again was he by any means wanting, either in respect for his superiors, or in deference to Church authority.

With such powers of mind, then, and such acquirements, with such candour and such earnest love for the truth, and above all, with such moral and religious excellence, it might seem that our author was fully furnished with all that could contribute either to the attaining or to the preserving of true and orthodox doctrine. But alas! singularly excellent as was his furnishing in all other respects, there was one thing wanting, and the want of that one rendered all the rest (so far as doctrine was concerned) worse than useless. He had learnt unhappily to *defer*, instead of to *submit*, to the authority of the Church; and this his anchor lost, the excellence of his other tackling did but render him the surer sport for the winds of false and heretical doctrine. Minds of a more ordinary calibre, if they fancy they think for themselves, do little more, at the most, than follow some favourite leader; and hence, happily, the amount of *their* danger is limited: if not the Church, they have at least these leaders for anchors, and beyond the limit of these, are not, generally speaking, in danger of straying far. This however was not our author's case: with a mind of a higher and nobler order than to be the slave of its fellows, and above the false and servile humility of being chained to the prejudices either of the great or of the many, he was unable, with the generality of mankind, from untrue premisses to draw, or rather *with* untrue premisses *to connect*, true conclusions; and hence the reception of any one of those various false principles which lie undeveloped, or scarcely at all developed, in the less productive and less emancipated minds of men of more ordinary powers, involved in him the reception of *all its legitimate consequences*.

It may be hoped, indeed, that numbers who profess no more than our author,—not *submission*, but simply *deference*, to the authority of the Church,—if they have not within them, implicitly at least, and to a certain extent, although without its being distinctly recognized by themselves, the *principle* of *submission*, have at all events an instinctive religious horror of

those more fearful heresies which affect not merely our relations with God, but even His Nature Itself;—a religious horror such as to make them at once tremble instinctively at these marks of the especial presence of Satan;—and it is the absence of such religious instinct, which gives the chief ground for fear as to the case of those who either hold themselves, or think lightly of the sin of holding, heresy of this awful kind. It rests not, however, with man to judge, how far, either in our author's or in any other particular case, any possible peculiarity of circumstances may in such sort have interfered with the application, without destroying the principle, of such religious instinct, that the blindness thereby produced may have been rather mental than spiritual; how far, as was observed above, heresies even such as our author's may have been the faults rather of the head than of the heart^x.

It remains only to say a word with respect to the Work now before us. Its author, it must be fully understood, professed in the strongest manner, during the whole course of the controversy, to adhere entirely to the doctrine and discipline of the Church of Rome; whose Communion indeed, even half a century after, when at length his mind had so fearfully strayed from her faith, he never ventured formally to renounce. It need not, therefore, appear surprising, that while he differed from almost all other Members of that Church in maintaining the validity of the Anglican Orders, he was yet very far from defending Anglicans from the charge of schism, or maintaining that even such of their ministrations as were valid if performed^y, could therefore be performed lawfully, or were intitled, when performed, to the promise of accompanying grace.

His Work, therefore, as respects Anglicans continuing Anglicans is rather speculative than practical: with respect to *them*, however he may differ from Roman Catholics in general as to their precise position outside, he

^x As the reader may be glad to have a synoptical view of the various literary labours of our author,—of all of which, so far as the present Editor is aware of them, a more or less full account has been given in the course of this Introduction,—the following is added.

I. His earlier labours, of which some account has been given, p. xv, xvi.

II. Those relating to, or connected with, the question of the Anglican Orders, viz.—1. The present Dissertation. 2. The Defence of the present Dissertation. 3. The Supplement to these two Works. 4. The Relation, in which are included, as the reader will have observed, several Letters, &c. previously published separately. To which four Works, of which so much has been said in this Introduction, may be added, 5. His Latin Oration at Oxford, concerning which see p. xlviii, note x.

III. His subsequent Works, viz. 1, 2,

and 3, his French Translations, with notes, of Father Paul's Italian History of the Council of Trent, and of Sleidan's Latin History of the Reformation, together with the Defence of the former Translation:—see p. xlix and liii. And 4 and 5. The two posthumous Works of which an account has just been given.

^y Such is the Consecration of the Eucharist, which according to the teaching of the Church of Rome, is performed *validly*, although not lawfully, nor consequently with the promise of accompanying grace, even by a schismatical or heretical Priest;—whereas Absolution, (which, over and above a valid Ordination, requires also an actual deputation of the authority of the Church,) if pronounced, even by her own acknowledged Priests, outside the limits of such authority, or after such authority has been withdrawn, is altogether null and void.

does not question that they *are* without the pale of the Catholic Church ; and it is only with reference to the case either of Anglican Clergymen individually, or of the Anglican Church as a body, returning to the bosom of the Church of Rome, that the question assumes a more practical aspect. It is, then, the case of such Clerical converts which forms the great business of his book ; and with respect to them, his object is to shew, that the hitherto received practice of the Church of Rome, in requiring them (if admitted to her Ministry) to be reordained,—even though he contends himself that such re-ordination neither needs nor ought to be regarded as more than a conditional Sacrament, intended as a wise precaution^z,—rests on insufficient grounds, and ought to be abandoned.

Even *this* question his principal antagonist, Le Quien^a, regards as no better than speculative ; the Church, as he observes, being satisfied in practice, where consequences of such overwhelming importance are involved, with nothing less than absolute certainty ; so that, be the probability never so great, still, if it fall short of “ complete demonstration ”^b, she prefers the safer course of making sure, by such a re-ordination as has just been mentioned, that her children receive the substance, and not a mere shadow, of the Sacraments of life.^c Our author, on the other hand, conceives that he has succeeded in banishing at least every rational doubt ; the arguments he has produced on the historical branch of the question being, as he maintains, quite as satisfactory as any reasonable man can expect in an inquiry of the kind ;—and as to the theological department,—although the principles on which he builds were by no means agreed upon amongst the ancients, as he shews at large himself in the fifteenth Chapter of the present Work, nor have ever been affirmed since by the authority of the Church,—there being notwithstanding, as he undertakes to shew, very good reasons to be assigned,—such reasons moreover as the generality of more modern writers have acquiesced in,—why these principles *ought* at least never to have been doubted of,—and therefore, although not hitherto adopted, *might* at least, as he contends, be safely adopted by the authority of the Church.

This then is the question on which issue is joined ; and of this question the present Work, now first presented in a correct state to the English reader, sets forth in a masterly style the leading features of the side opposed to reordination.

^z It is not necessary to the conditionality of a Sacrament, that the condition be *expressed*. In some re-ordinations, indeed, in which the doubt was but slight,—in order to preclude misapprehension, it has been done ;* as, for the same reason, it always is in Baptism : this however is a mere matter of expediency, the Church in

no case intending to give what is already possessed, but only what is not possessed.

^a Nullité &c., vol. 2, p. 394—396.

^b I. e. if there remain at last any *assignable* doubt not fully cleared up.

^c Nullité &c. vol. 2. p. 387, 388, with the historical instances adduced p. 388—394.

* So in the historical instances referred to in note *c*.

ADDITIONAL NOTES

TO THE PRECEDING INTRODUCTION.

Page v, note *e*. To the mistakes of the Socinian biographer add in its proper place:—
8. On p. xxii it is implied that at least some direct threat of excommunication on the part of the General of his Order preceded and caused his departure. Compare p. 1, notes *c* and *.

Ibid. col. 2, l. 7 from the end, to “xlvi.” add as a sub-note:

This error, too, is at least naturally implied in the statement of the Anecdotes of Bowyer, p. 85; in which we read that “he got safe to England, where he was well received; but he complained to Abp “Wake that it was a bad country for a religious man to reside in, because of the unhappy differences” &c. as in the note referred to.

To the sub-note already found on this page add as a new paragraph:

The second has found its way also into the *Allgemeine Encyclopædie* of Leipsic 1818, through the fault, probably, of Bamberger (see the addition to p. vii, note *), who is mentioned in the list of authorities. From the same source may have been derived *Eating* for *Ealing*: see p. 1.

vii, in note *, after “1816.” insert:

They were also made especial use of in Bamberger’s *German Anecdotes* of the most celebrated British literary Characters of the 18th Cent., 8vo, 2 vols, 1786 and 1787; a compilation which, though useful, is without literary accuracy,—according to the compiler’s *Life* in the *Allgemeine Encyclopædie* of Leipsic 1818.

ix, to note *k*, omitting of course the italic reference, add as two new paragraphs:

P.S. Since this Introduction was put into type, the present Editor has himself paid a visit to the Library, and turned through the leaves of the copy there preserved of the Dissertation, but without observing any thing more than two slight verbal corrections, both already included in the Errata at the end of the original, viz. those on the eighth and fourteenth pages of the Preface, of which the first is the one referred to in the Editor’s note to p. 20 B 13.—In the Defence he did not observe any other additions or corrections than those which his friend had already communicated: it must be added, however, that in the case of that Work he did not think it necessary to do much more than collate the matter already sent him.—The Supplement he turned through, and found three corrections, together with a note dated Dec. 14. 1737, and signed with the author’s name; all which he has thought it desirable to preserve at the end of this volume, after the additions and corrections to the Defence.

In the same Library he saw also the second (or documentary) volume of the Relation (the first was not there, or not in the way) but did not observe any MS. corrections in it; any more than in the “Examen &c.” mentioned on p. li, which also was there, but which he did not feel it necessary to examine particularly.

ix, to the end of the second paragraph, add as a note:

It should be observed that at the end of the Defence there are a few additional Errata for the original of the present Work, besides those at the end of the present Work itself. Both the one and the other have been made use of by the present Editor; by whom, however,—in order to make this Edition as complete as possible,—for the benefit of those who may happen to have at hand the original of the present Work, but not that of its Defence, it has been thought best to reprint these additional Errata at the end of this volume, before the MS. additions and corrections to the Defence and Supplement mentioned in note *k* and its PS.

xvi, line 9, to “*Sçavante*” add as a note:

“He had also furnished several [or many (*plusieurs*)] articles for the *Journal de l’Europe Sçavante*.” *Nouveau Dict. Hist.* of 1786.

In the printed Catalogue of the King’s Library in the British Museum is found the following fallacious entry: “*Lettres sur ses querelles, et sur des Mémoires dans l’*

“Europe Savante. 12 vol. 8vo. à la Haye, 1718—1720.” (*Letters on his contests, and on Mémoires in the Europe Savante, 12 volumes, 8vo. the Hague, 1718—1720.*)—On asking for the Work so described, the first twelve Nos. of the Europe Savante itself (being the Nos. for 1718—1720) were brought the present Editor. Compare the additional notes to p. xlix, note *y*, and p. liii, l. 10.

xvii, line 4, to “chief” add as a note :

In the Relation &c. vol. 1, p. 329, Father Prevôt is mentioned as “one of the Librarians of St. Geneviève”. Compare with this the quotation on p. xv.—Dr. Bell, too, in the Advertisement to the *Traité &c.* (see p. lix. lx), speaking of the time of our author’s leaving France, says that he was then “chief Librarian”.

xvii, note *c*, line 4, to “1720” add as a sub-note :

The first article in the Collection is a letter from Mr. B. to the Abp, dated Nov. 28. 1717; the last an extract of a letter from the Abp to Mr. B., dated Ap. 19. 1720.

xviii, note *c*, last paragraph, to “4090)” add as a sub-note :

For the authorities on which the account of this earlier correspondence given in this article rests, see the article itself, comparing also a letter in the *Gent. Mag.* for 1767 (vol. 37, p. 241), dated Canterbury, Ap. 18. 1767, and written, as we learn from the *Lit. Anecd.* (see p. vii, note *), vol. 9, p. 355, by Dr. Osmund Beauvoir himself. The letter is written to defend the Abp against the charge of Archdeacon Blackburne, put forward in an anonymous Work intitled *The Confessional*, of having been willing to unite the Anglican and Gallican Churches, each community retaining most of its own peculiar doctrines;—a charge from which Maclaine and the *Biog. Brit.* also vindicate his Grace. The contrary, Dr. O. B. tells us (p. 242) can be proved from his Grace’s own letters, “and it is hoped will “by the publication of some of them”, alluding of course to the above Edition of Mosheim, which came out the year after.

To the end of the above-mentioned paragraph itself add :—We find him however, in a letter of his own, dated March 27. 1775, (*Lit. Anecd. &c.* vol. 9, p. 355,) mentioning the purchase of some other MSS; and we may easily believe that, possessing as he did, the correspondence with respect to the projected union, he would be glad to procure also, if possible, and add to his collection, the letters which had passed through his father’s hands to our author, who indeed may very naturally have given them to him before his death.—Dr. Osmund Beauvoir died himself A.D. 1789, aged 67; having been one of the most accomplished classical scholars of his day. Some account of him is given in the *Lit. Anecd.* vol. 9, p. 351—359: see also pp. 747 and 810.

xli, to note *b* add : —*MS. list of publications connected with the present Work, furnished by a friend.* The Editor has not been able to see Le Quien’s second Work himself.

xliv, to the end of note *e* add the following sentence and sub-note :—The *Allgemeine Encyclopædie*, too, gives twenty-two Bishops and thirty-two articles.*

* Before this decision took place our author wrote to complain to the Cardinal de Bissy Aug. 13 and 19; before it was announced (see p. xlv, note *i*), to Cardinal Fleury also (see p. xx, note *l*), Aug. 23. The only reply he received was a verbal message from the former Cardinal Aug. 21, after the business had been settled in three or four sittings, (*Rel.* vol. 1, p. 128, with the memorandum just about to be mentioned.) These letters, with an introductory paragraph and a memorandum at the end, form the 14th Art. (p. 161—176) of the second (or documentary) volume of the *Relation &c.*, the letters to the former Cardinal beginning p. 162 and 168, that to the latter p. 171.

xlv, in note *i*, after “1727.” add : — (*MS list mentioned in the addition to note b, p. xli.*)

xlvi, to the end of note *k* add as a sub-note :

In this latter volume this Pastoral is reprinted entire, and makes (with an introductory paragraph) Art. 24 (p. 309—321).

xlvii, l. 18, to “imply.” add as a note :

On p. 124, in the postscript of a letter dated June 25. 1728, Mrs Morice (the Bishop’s daughter) writes to her father :—“The inclosed letter is just now come from Père Courayer, and very opportunely, since mine scarce deserves your reading.”

xlix, note *x*, after col. 1, l. 3, add as a separate paragraph :

The publication in 1729 of the *Relation &c.* which has so often been quoted has already been mentioned: see pp. viii. and xvii.

xlix, to the last paragraph of note *x* add as a sub-note :

Maclaine, however, in the place quoted, speaks of Kiærning’s account of the correspondence with respect to the projected union (see p. xvii, note *c*) as “full of mistakes”, and as having probably misled Mosheim, who had certainly, he says, a very imperfect idea of the matter.—Mosheim, it may be observed, presided at the delivery of this Dissertation (*Allg. Encykl. &c.*);—which appears to have misled

Heumann, who in his *Programma* on the theology of Courayer (*Nova Syll.* vol. 1, p. 261: see the additional note to p. li) wrongly attributes the Dissertation itself to Mosheim.—In the same place we are also told, that our author, finding some errors in the Dissertation in question, corrected them in a short Treatise which he inserted in the *Nouvelle Bibliothèque*, vol. 7, p. 541 &c.; from which it would seem that we should read, either 541 in the *Allg. Encycl.* (see the preceding paragraph), or 341 in this *Programma*.—It may be added that we learn further from the same paper of Heumann's (p. 260, 261) that a little before Kiørning, Rathlefus also gave some account of our author's life in the *Europa docta nostri temporis* (*l' Europe Savante?*), vol. 3, p. 233.

xlix, note *y*, to the end of line 4 add as a sub-note:

The Catalogue of the King's Library in the British Museum represents this Edition as containing portraits of the Queen and *our author*. It should be the Queen and *Father Paul*. Compare the additional notes to p. xvi, l. 9, and p. liii, l. 10.

Ibid., to the end of the first paragraph add:—It had been undertaken at the command of her Majesty, as appears from the opening of the dedication to which allusion has been made.

Ibid., paragraph 2, to "Antony de Dominis" add as a sub-note:

An Abp of Spalatro, who renounced, but subsequently returned to, the Communion of the Church of Rome. He was handsomely preferred by James I.

Ibid., last paragraph, after "28, 29." insert:—Also Boswell's Life of Johnson.

Ibid., to "German" add as a sub-note:

The German Translation, however, according to the former authority (which quotes Ernesti's Theological Library, vol. 2, p. 717 &c.), is full of faults, omissions, and inaccuracies.

li, to l. 15 add the following note and sub-note:

For German opinions of this Work the *Allgemeine Encyclopædie* of Leipsic 1818 refers to Salig's History of the Council of Trent, vol. 3, p. 197; Baumgarten's account of a Library at Halle, vol. 3, p. 450; Heumann's *Programma* de Theologiâ Curayerianâ*, Göttingen, 1745, 4to,—reprinted also in his *Nova Sylloge Dissertationum* [in two volumes, 12mo, 1752 and 1754] vol. 1, p. 260 [—275] (see the additional sub-note to p. xlix, note *x*);—and the Göttingen Literary Gazette, 1745, No. 43.

* A short paper preceding, by the rules of the University, his Inaugural Oration on being made an Ordinary Professor of Theology. (P. 275.)

lviii, l. 13, to "tranquillity." add as a note:

The whole extract is: "Dr Courayer dined with us the day before he left Town: he was more elated with having a letter from you, than he had been dejected with the overthrow of the French: he looks well," &c. as before.

lviii, line 10, to "History of the Reformation" add as a note:

It would seem from a general title-page prefixed to the proper title-page of the first volume, that our author had intended to translate *all* Sleidan's Works. It may be added that this prefixed general title-page has misled the compilers of the printed Catalogues both of the King's Library in the British Museum (compare the additional notes to p. xvi, l. 9, and p. xlix, note *y*) and of the Bodleian.

lix, last line, to "Prebendary of Westminster;" add as a note:

The Founder of the Bell Scholarships at Cambridge.

lxi, to note *u* add as a new paragraph:

That he was a Socinian (in the popular sense of the term: see p. v, note *c*) is clear, not merely from his own language in his account of our author, but also from his own express declaration, "Mr. Lindsey and myself being both Unitarians", in a letter dated May 27. 1772, and preserved in Nichols's Literary Hist. of the 18th Cent. vol. 5, p. 425.—In the *Lit. Anecd.* (vol. 9, p. 805) we are told that "having long declined the Office of a teacher, he became a warm admirer of the doctrinal system in Essex Street."

AN
EPITOME
OF THE WHOLE VOLUME,
IN WHICH IS INCLUDED
THE OLD TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(Concerning this Epitome see the Editor's Introduction, p. xiii.)

THE TITLE-PAGE OF THE PRESENT EDITION (P. i).

Note. For the title-page of the original, see p. xviii, xix of the preceding Introduction; for an alteration which the author directed Mr. Williams to make in his English Edition, see that gentleman's Preface, p. 10 A. That alteration, however, (from *A Dissertation &c.* to *A Defence, &c.*), having tended to confound the present Work itself with the Defence of the present Work published three years later by its author, and the present Work itself having been known and distinguished as *the Dissertation &c.* during the protracted controversies to which its publication gave rise,—it has been thought best in the present Edition, to restore the original title.

THE EDITOR'S INTRODUCTION.

CONTAINING SOME ACCOUNT, AS WELL OF THE PRESENT AND FORMER EDITIONS, AS OF THE AUTHOR HIMSELF, AND THE MEMORABLE CONTROVERSIES TO WHICH THE PRESENT WORK GAVE RISE.

I. *Account of the present and former Editions.*

Page iii. Call for a new Edition of the present Work.—Browne's Work on the Nag's-head story.—Mistaken testimony of Courayer to the correctness of Mr. Williams's translation.—iii, iv. Gradual discovery of the extreme wretchedness of that performance.—iv. Alterations made by Mr. Williams in consequence of directions from the author, but without any formal enumeration of the altered passages:—this an obstacle to the discarding altogether of his translation.—Plan the present Editor was obliged in consequence to follow.

v. Statement of our author's Socinian biographer (Dr. Calder) that the Work was reprinted in 1727 (the original Edition having been in 1723).—This biographer's account of the French part of our author's life filled with mistakes.—vi. The question discussed.—Mistake of the Anecdotes of Bowyer, followed by the London Biog. Dict. and others.—Errors with respect to Courayer in the *Biographie Universelle*.—Biographical Treasury.—vi, vii. Sources of the Socinian biographer's information.—vii. Jones of Nayland.—Smyth.—Nichols.—Kippis.—The existence of such Second Edition of no consequence, unless the Edition itself was revised by the author:—viii. if this could have been ascertained, the use of Mr. Williams's translation might have been almost entirely dispensed with.—Reasons for believing that, if there was a Second Edition, at all events it was not

revised by the author.—Mr. Williams's First Edition published both at London and at Dublin A.D. 1725.

viii, ix. No MS. corrections in the copy of the original Edition preserved in Abp Tension's Library, to which the author gave his books some time before his death.

ix. Result of the collation the present Editor was obliged to make :—no sufficient reason for supposing that Mr. W. had authority for any other alterations than those for which he himself expressly claims such authority.—The difference between Mr. W.'s two Editions, notwithstanding what he professes in his Advertisement to the Second, comparatively unimportant.—x. The supposition that the faults of his First Edition may be transferred to those who had the care of his MS., which the Advertisement to his Second may seem to imply, and at all events our author directly advances in his favour, altogether untenable.—How such an extraordinarily wretched performance is to be accounted for :—xi. mutilations :—omission in both Editions of the whole third Article of the Appendix, in consequence of this translator's having altogether mistaken its contents !—How his Second Edition came to be so little improved.—Previous Work of his on the same subject.—How our author's complimentary letter to him may be accounted for.

xii. Improvements in the present Edition :—the collation and correction of references and quotations :—the translation into English of all the Latin and other quotations not already translated.—More important additions are :—1. Running titles at the tops and sides of the pages.—2. Considerable insertions within brackets (besides the above translations of quotations),—Mr. W.'s insertions being distinguished by an obelisk (†) or otherwise.—xiii. 3. A considerable body of Further Notes.—4. An Epitome of the whole Volume, in which is included the old Table of Contents,—and which will also answer the purpose of an Index.—Mr. Williams's Index, or Apology for an Index, together with all his other Editorial matter, retained.—The present Introduction itself :—(reasons for saying so much with respect to Mr. W.'s Edition.)—xiii, xiv. Suggestion of some improvements in arrangement for another Edition.—xiv. Why the Further Notes were not placed under the text in the present.—This Edition originally undertaken for the Anglo-Catholic Library.—Grounds of its withdrawal from that Series.—xv. Thanks for assistance.

II. *Account of the Author, and of the memorable controversies to which the present Work gave rise.*

xv. Birth and early studies &c. of Courayer.—He enters the Congregation of St. Geneviève :—is made a Presbyter of his Congregation and Professor of Theology in 1706 :—Chief Librarian in 1711.—The Library itself.—xv, xvi. His earlier literary labours.—xvi. Though far from being a Jansenist, he was yet an Anti-Constitutionary, or Appellant against the Bull *Unigenitus*,—as was also till 1728, the Cardinal de Noailles.

xvii. Origin of the present Work.—Mention of our author's Relation &c. published at Amsterdam in 1729.—The present Work approved by the Censor, Oct. 1. 1721 ; notwithstanding which the usual Privilege is withheld.—The author, however, enters into a correspondence with Abp Wake, to the advantage of the Work.—Previous correspondence between the Abp and Dr Dupin with respect to a projected union of the Anglican and Gallican Churches.—Letters of his Grace to our author.—xviii. Mr. Beauvoir and his son Dr Osmond Beauvoir.—The Work at length printed privately by some of the author's friends, in the latter part of 1723.

Title-page of the original.—xix. Its reception.—Complimentary letters.—Favourable Extracts in the *Nouvelles Littéraires* for Dec. 1723 and the *Journal des Sçavans* of Jan. and Feb. 1724.—xix, xx. Letters of our author, dated Jan. 12 and Feb. 5, 1724, to the Editor of the *J. de S.*, in the former of which he consents to the mention of his name.—xx. The Editor, however, severely reprimanded by Cardinal Fleury.—Particulars respecting this Cardinal and M. L' Abbé Fleury.

Answers or attacks: *our author's own account of them.*

1. Disparaging Extrait of the Journalists de Trevoux, Jesuits, in their No. for March 1724.—Their previous announcement of the Work, as well as (xx, xxi) conduct towards him on a former occasion.—xxi. His letter to them on the occasion mentioned.—Specimen given by our author of their veracity.—His letter to them on the occasion alluded to.—Do. on the present occasion.

2. (xxii) *Letters of a Theologian &c.* (viz. the Abbé Gervaise), Paris 1724—Character and motives of the writer.—Character of the Letters.—Their fate, viz. to be suppressed by public authority.

3. *The Dissertation of Father Courayer refuted by Father Hardouin of the Company of Jesus*, Paris, 1724.—xxii, xxiii. Extraordinary ideas of this learned author:—he rejected as spurious nearly all the monuments of antiquity.—Other extravagancies.—His mode of dealing with the present Work.—His second vol. intended to have been suppressed, but brought out, together with Reflections, in consequence of his dissatisfaction with Le Quien's concessions.—xxiv. Our author considered himself "refuted" only in the title-page.

4. Work of Le Quien, "Nullity of the Anglican Ordinations, &c.," Paris 1725.—Its great aim to raise doubt.

5. (xxiv, xxv) *Memoires of Fennel*, Paris 1726.—xxv. of tiresome length:—full of coarse, vulgar, and irrelevant matter.

6. *Letter of a Benedictine* (Pierre le Blanc) to our author,—confined to a theological difficulty.—Its civility and politeness an honourable exception.

Spirit of the other answerers:—Hardouin.—xxvi. Of Le Quien more at length.—Courayer's own opinion.—A great part of his Work attributed to Pierre Badoire, one of the Approvers.—Alleged discreditable intention of his to contest without cause the fact of Renaudot's having written the Mémoire to which the present Work is an answer.—xxvi, xxvii. Conduct with respect to a correspondence between our author and himself.—xxvii, xxviii.—Mode of dealing with the Anglican Deacons' Ordination Service and what our author had said of it.—xxviii. False quotations and translations charged against him by Browne.—xxviii-xxxi. Copious extracts from a letter to M. l'Abbé Sultaine, Prior of St. Geneviève, commenting severely on the character, both logical and moral, of his Answer.

xxxi. This Work, however, in our author's opinion, not merely "the most considerable", but also the only "rational" reply.

Against this, therefore, his Defence of the present Work, published in 1726, was directed, although he includes in it such of the objections of the other answerers as had been omitted by Le Quien, or better handled by them.—xxxi, xxxii. This Work, like the preceding, approved by the Censor; but, like it, (xxxii) refused the Privilege, and in consequence printed privately.

Extent of this second Work.—Title-page.—Reception.—Complimentary letters.—xxxiii. Extraits in the Journal des Sçavans of Feb. and April 1727: the second suppressed by the Keeper of the Seals, though not in time to prevent the escape of a few copies, from which it was afterwards reprinted.—xxxiii-xxxviii. Contents of the Work at length.—(xxxvii.) Note concerning the two Latin Lives of Parker.—xxxviii. Do. concerning the "Important Observations" of the Coadjutor of Orleans, with which commenced the Sacrificial controversy which eventually drove our author out of France,—as also concerning a MS. satire upon most of the Answers to the Dissertation.

xxxviii. Answers to the Defence before Le Quien's.—1. (xxxviii, xxxix.) That of Hardouin,—more extravagant than even his former production.—(Charge of forgery against Courayer by the same author: answered in a letter to Lord Percival.)—2. (xxxix) Of Theodoric de St. René:—doubts and speculations.—3. (xl) Of the Sieur

Vivant:—admission.—“The English Work of an anonymous Jesuit”,—“an ill assorted compilation &c.”,—in answer to the Dissertation alone, though published after the Defence.—Certain more obscure replies.—The foregoing noticed in the Preface to the Relation.

xl, xli. New Work of Le Quien in 1729:—in consequence of which (xli) our author published at Amsterdam in 1732 a Supplement to his two preceding Works.—Severe remarks on the character both logical and moral of Le Quien’s second Work, taken from the Preface to this Supplement.—xli-xliii. Contents of the Supplement at length, with a few notes.—xliv. Le Quien, if disposed to reply again, did not live to do it.

The incidental controversy with respect to the Sacrifice.—xliv, xlv. Leading features of the history of this latter controversy.—“Denunciation &c.” by Pelletier:—his character.—Letters of our author to the Cardinal de Noailles and M. Girardin, Doctor of the Sorbonne.—Mandate of the Bp of Marseilles, April 1727.—Of the Cardinal de Noailles, which, according to our author, was ante-dated Aug. 18. though in reality later than the Assembly of St. Germain,—i. e. the condemnation by twenty Bishops assembled under the Cardinal de Bissy at St. Germain des Prés, near Paris, Aug. 22. 1727, of the Dissertation and its Defence.—Order for the destruction of these Works.—Condemnation of the same by the Council of Embrun under Cardinal Tencin, the Abp of that See, Sep. 26:—the Council had been assembled to condemn Soanen, Bp of Senez, a zealous Anti-Constitutionary:—who this Cardinal was.—Mandates of other Bishops.—Conference between our author and his Superior at Auteuil Oct. 29.—Friendship towards him of the Superior and the Duc de Noailles.—His letter of Oct. 30 to the Cardinal de Noailles.—What our author professed.—Pastoral Instruction of the Cardinal de Noailles dated Oct. 31, but which did not appear till the 21st or 22nd of Dec.—In order to disavow safely the sense put by this Instruction upon his letter of Oct. 30, our author makes his escape into England in the latter part of January 1728.—Previous friendly assurances of Abp Wake.—The Cardinal de Noailles professed distinctly to pronounce no opinion as to validity of the Anglican Orders.—xlvi. Letter of Jan. 12. 1728 left by our author for the Cardinal de Noailles.—Degree of D.D. previously conferred on our author by the University of Oxford.—xlvi, xlvii. His retirement at that time, by leave, at the Priory of Hennemont near St. Germain en Laye.—His friendship for and parting visit from Bp Atterbury.

xlvii. Journey to England.—Delay at Calais.—Friendly reception.—xlvii, xlviii. Private liberality and hospitality shewn him.—xlviii, xlix. National pension of £100 per annum:—doubled by Queen Caroline in 1736.—His Latin Oration at Oxford in 1733.—Jesting pamphlets concerning him.—His conversations and correspondence with Kiercing.—xlix. His French Translation, with notes, in 1736, of Father Paul’s Italian History of the Council of Trent.—(Antony de Dominis.—Dr. Johnson.)—Increase of income derived thereby.—xlix, l. His easy circumstances, frugal habits, and extensive charities.—l. Relations in France.—His endeavours to confess.—Excommunicated by his Superior Jan. 30. 1728.—His letter to the Superior, Mar. 15. 1728.—l, li. In London he attended only the services of the Church of Rome; but in some country-places the Anglican prayers, with which “he always expressed great satisfaction”.—li. Jer. Markland’s opinion of his Preface to his Translation of the History of the Council of Trent.—His anonymous Work (Amsterdam, 1744) on the defects of theology.—Warburton’s opinion of him.—Remarks of Voltaire.—lii. Mention of our author in 1749.—Said to have been offered and to have refused a Bishopric in the Anglican Church.—Social intercourse with the Princesses Amelia and Elizabeth-Caroline, daughters of George II.—Reserve and cautiousness in conversation.—Invitation back to St Geneviève from the then Superior in 1763:—not certain it was ever delivered.—liii. Further mention of him the same year.—His French Translation, with notes, 1767-1769, of Sleidan’s Latin History of

the Reformation.—Humane feelings on the suppression of the Jesuits in 1773.—Suspensions of the character of Archibald Bower, author of the “Lives of the Popes”,—verified by the detection for which the public was indebted to Dr Douglas.—Good character of our author.—liii, liv. His failure of sight and hearing towards the end of his life.—liv. Letter from him.—Miss Talbot:—her family.—His death, Oct. 17. 1776, aged 95.—His burial.—His Will.—His books given before-hand to Abp Tension’s Library in St Martin’s Parish London.—lv. An elder brother still alive.—Mrs Gulston’s small portrait of him in his old age.—Question about the place of his birth.—Bp Atterbury’s picture of him in earlier life:—now in the Bodleian.—History of this picture, with further mention of its subject, from a letter of Mr. Godwyn’s from Balliol College, Oxford, Nov. 27. 1768.—lvi. Extract of another letter of the same gentleman’s dated Mar. 12. 1768.—Latin Epitaph by Mr. Kynaston, in full, corrected as it should have stood.—lvii. Literal English translation of do.—Inscription (with translation) under the picture in the Bodleian.—Anecdote from Ealing.—lvii, lviii. Descriptive particulars &c. concerning our author from Mrs Montagu’s letters.

lviii, -lx. Posthumous Works given by our author to the Princess Amelia (daughter of George II), and published by her Chaplain, Dr William Bell, Prebendary of Westminster, in 1787 and 1811; shewing clearly the fearfully unsound views into which he had fallen, as well on the doctrines of the Trinity and Incarnation as on other points.—Some account of these Works.—Why they were not published sooner.—lx. Reasons of Dr Bell for publishing them at all.—Remark of Chalmers;—who, however, is mistaken as to our author’s character.—Dr Bell’s conduct censured by the Quarterly Review;—defended in a letter in the *Gent. Mag.*—lx, lxi. Particulars treated of in our author’s *Latest Sentiments* (the Work published in 1787).—This last mentioned Work translated the same year by the Socinian (Dr Calder) already alluded to.—Our author’s views, however, not exactly those of the Socinians.—Synoptical view of his literary labours.

lxi—lxiii. Remarks on the nature and moral of our author’s case.—lxiii, lxiv. Preliminary explanations regarding the present Work.—What the question is, and how much the author maintains.

ADDITIONAL NOTES TO THE PRECEDING INTRODUCTION.

lxv. Mistakes of the Socinian biographer and others.—Bamberger.—Result of a visit by the present Editor to St. Martin’s Library.—Additional Errata for the present Work, contained in the Defence.—lxv, &c. Mistakes in the Catalogue of the King’s Library in the British Museum.—lxvi. Correspondence concerning the union of the Anglican and Gallican Churches:—Dr Osmund Beauvoir:—“The Confessional”.—Original letters of Abp Wake to our author.—Our author’s letters to the Cardinals de Bissy and Fleury.—Letter of his forwarded by Mrs Morice (daughter of Bp Atterbury) to her father.—The Relation &c.—Kiørning’s mistakes:—Mosheim:—Heumann’s Programma on our author’s theology:—lxvii. Rathlefius.—Queen Caroline (wife of George II).—Antony de Dominis.—German Translation and German opinions of our author’s Council of Trent.—Our author in England.—Dr. Bell.—Dr Calder really a Socinian.

MR. WILLIAMS’S TITLE-PAGE AND DEDICATION (p. 1 and 3).

MR. WILLIAMS’S ADVERTISEMENT (p. 4).

The First Edition mutilated:—the Second corrected and improved*.

MR. WILLIAMS’S PREFACE.

Page 5. Reasons for translating this book.—Fitness of the author for his work.—French much in need of being undeceived.—Useful tendency of the Work: hopes of

* Concerning this profession see the Editor’s Introduction, p. ix—xi.

unity.—6. Its reception in France.—Answers expected to it, especially from Father Le Quien:—his learning;—disadvantages.—7. Incompetency of previous advocates of that side of the question.—“Exceptionable passages” in this Work:—allowance to be made for its author’s being a Roman Catholic.—What the reader is to expect.—8. Mr. Williams not at liberty to write against the Church of Rome in this Preface.—His answer to the author’s objections as to the manner of the Anglican Bishops’ coming into their Sees:—according to Mr. Williams the Marian, not the Elizabethan, Bishops the intruders.—9. Anyhow (he maintains), upon the death of the former, the latter became legally possessed.—The English Roman Catholics, according to Mr. Williams, not even on the footing of a national Church.—Execution of the translation:—the author’s compliments. 10. Alterations directed by the author:—the French of the omitted passages retained in the Appendix:—the title altered.—Latin quotations not translated in the original Work:—translated where necessary, and the original thrown to the bottom of the page, in his Edition.*

THE AUTHOR’S LETTER TO MR. WILLIAMS.

11 and 14. (Supposed) fidelity of the translation (see the Editor’s Introduction, p. xi, xii):—New that such a Work should come from a Catholic.—The Nag’s-head story a parallel to that of Pope Joan:—truth in the end triumphant.—12, 13 and 15, 16. Unity the author’s object.—Testimony to the learning &c. of Anglicans.—Disposition towards those who may find fault with him.—Obligations to Mr. Williams.—Wish for the return of the Anglican Church.

THE AUTHOR’S PREFACE.

17. The subject of this Work neglected in France:—not by the English.—Mason’s Work.—Champney’s answer:—unequal:—replied to by Mason.—18. Bramhall.—Burnet.—Origin of the present Work.—Memoir of M. l’ Abbé Renaudot:—unsatisfactory.—19. Author’s own original design.—English pamphlet “*De Vera &c.*”.—The question.—Anglican Schism not to be excused.—20. Advantage of making known the truth of their Succession.—Opinion of Bossuet.—21. Re-ordinations odious.—22. Plan of the Work:—proofs of facts.—23. Author’s disinterestedness.—24. Delay of publication.—M. l. Abbé Renaudot’s Mémoire.

MEMOIRE OF M. L’ ABBE RENAUDOT.

25. Lawful Ordination found only in the Church of Rome.—Attempts of Protestants to steal it.—Bohemian Brothers.—Richard Creagh.—26. Commissions of Queen Elizabeth.—Ordination of Parker.—27. Objections of the Catholics.—Mason.—Record of the Ordination:—not published till more than fifty years after the time.—27. Barlow not consecrated himself.—Bonner.—Edward the Sixth’s Ordinal entirely defective.—28. Ordinations under Henry VIII. allowed in Mary’s reign.—29. Eastern Ordinations.—Rectifying Act in the 8th year of Elizabeth.—Catholic challenges.—30. Summing up.—Different conduct of Anglicans towards the French Calvinists and towards such as go over to them from the Church of Rome.

A DISSERTATION ON THE VALIDITY OF THE
ORDINATIONS OF THE ENGLISH, &c.

CHAPTER I.

History of the Changes that have taken place in the administration of Orders among the English since the time of the Reformation.

P. 31. Separation of Henry VIII. from the Church of Rome.—1533 the first year of the Schism.—Henry VIII. made but few other innovations.—32. Statute concerning Ordi-

* Concerning this profession see the Editor’s Introduction, p. xii.

nations.—Under Edward VI. an altogether new form of Ordination.—This abolished under Mary.—33. Restored under Elizabeth in 1559.—Confirmed in 1566.—Episcopacy abolished at the time of the Rebellion.—Restored, and the Prayer-book and Form of Ordination revised, under Charles II.

Changes in Scotland.—Superintendants &c. appointed in 1560.—34. In 1572 a semblance of Bishops.—Discipline of 1578 :—fully established at Edinburgh in 1581.—Robert Bruce (1598) :—his idea of Ordination and imposition of hands.—35. James I. restores Episcopacy :—question about previous Orders.—The Rebellion :—Episcopacy abolished.—More regularly restored in 1664.—36. Revolution of 1688 :—Episcopacy abolished a third time.

Cases of England and Scotland compared.—37. The Scotch Ordinations depend on the English.—Five changes in England.—Cromwell.—38. Henry VIII.—Remaining question.—Parker.

CHAPTER II.

History of Parker's Ordination by Barlow. Authenticity of the Record wherein it is related, and falsehood of the stories published on the subject.

39. Elizabeth.—Death of Cardinal Pole.—Parker.—His election.—The Queen's Commissions.—40. Her dispensation.—41. Parker confirmed and consecrated.—The Record.—Camden.—42. Parker's Journal.—Neale's alleged story as given by Champney :—43. Refutation of this story :—44. from Rymer :—from probability :—Sanders :—45. Bonner :—Scory :—46. late origin of the story.—Three objections to the Record.—Obj. I. 'The Record not produced for fifty years.'—Answer.—47. The Record cited in Parker's own time.—Shewed to and examined by certain Roman Catholics in Abp Abbot's time.—48. Their unreasonable request.—Re-examined at our author's desire.—Letter of Abp Wake to the author.—49. Obj. II. 'Producers of the Record interested.'—Suspicion unjust.—The Record agrees with those in Rymer.—Had it been forged, it would have been drawn up differently.—50. Obj. III. 'The Record variously cited.'—Answer.—Queen's Commission.—51. Sutcliffe.—Butler.—Richard for John.—Those who have published the Record itself have always agreed.—52. The Record still exists.—Reproaches of contemporaries explained.—53. Objection from the silence of Stow.—Answer.—Stow himself destroys the supposed inference.—54. Possible causes of his silence.—Obj. 'Three of the Bps named in the first Commission had already been deposed: this Commission is therefore forged; &c.'—55. The fact not true.—The Bp of Durham.—Of Bath.—56. Of Peterborough.—Stow's statement explained.—57. Conclusion.—Testimony of the Earl of Nottingham.—Feigned evidence on the other side.

CHAPTER III.

Barlow, Parker's Consecrator, was himself consecrated. Proofs of this Consecration.

58. Obj. "Barlow not consecrated" :—three grounds of objection.—59. Answer :—testimonies :—Godwin :—Wharton :—Le Neve :—60. Strype.—Many other Consecrations omitted in Cranmer's Register.—61. Apparent difficulty :—different style of reckoning.—Error of Strype. (Note of Mr. Williams's concerning other errors of his.)—62. More definite facts which ascertain Barlow's Consecration.—King's Mandate :—penalties of not obeying.—Investiture.—63. Seat in Parliament.—Usage in this respect :—Mocket :—Bramhall :—64. Burnet :—Private letters.—Barlow summoned with the rest.—65. Sat there.—Convocation :—Barlow present :—his place there :—usage in this respect.—Barlow consecrated others :—66. Bulkeley :—(law of Henry VIII :—) Parker.—67. His resignation assigned by Queen Mary as the ground of the vacancy of his See.—His subsequent deprivation forms no solid objection, but the contrary.—68. Negative proof.—69. Summing up.

CHAPTER IV.

Answer to the reasons on the other side [see p. 58]. The public Instruments prove nothing against Barlow's Consecration.

69. First objection (see p. 58).—Want of the Record supplied by testimony,—by Acts,—by silence,—by acknowledgement,—(70) by examples of similar omissions.—Barlow not a mere Usufructuary.—Unreasonableness of objectors.—71. Answer.—Second objection (see p. 58):—what strengthens it.—72. Answer.—*Consecrare* often both inserted and omitted wrongly.—Examples,—1. of wrong insertion:—Capon,—(73.) Hethe,—Holbeche,—Wickham,—Hutton,—Bellot,—(74) Vaughan,—Thornborough.—2. Of wrong omission:—Cowper,—Bradbridge,—(75) Hughes,—May [*or* Mey],—Matthews.—Summing up.—76. But the Instrument itself is miscopied:—testimony to that effect.—77. Anyhow proof should be brought of Barlow's having been actually consecrated by Parker.—Negative testimonies to the contrary: Parker's Life,—(78.) Camden,—Godwin,—and others.—79. Result.—Objection from the term *Bishop Elect*.—80. Answer:—Barlow's case peculiar.—Admissions of Champney and Ward.—Reason of the term.—81. Juxon a parallel case.—Barlow's Record of translation.—82. Further remarks and confirmatory examples.—Supposed collusion between Cranmer and Barlow:—their heretical sentiments.—83. Answer.—Difficulty or rather impossibility of such a thing.—84. Incidental proof of Barlow's Consecration from the charge of heresy made against him.—His practice.—85. Other documents lost.—Inconsistency in the supposition.

CHAPTER V.

Bonner's threat of excommunication is chimerical; and were it real, it would prove nothing against Barlow's Consecration.

86. Bonner's threat.—Neale's (alleged) story.—87. I. The story false.—Renaudot does not venture to insist on it.—88. The threat altogether improbable.—Bonner deposed.—St. Mary le Bow and many other London Churches in the sole jurisdiction of the Abp of Canterbury.—So the Palace of Lambeth, where Parker was consecrated.—89. Bishops' residences in general exempt.—The threat inconsistent with itself.—90. The Bp of Llandaff not likely to regard it.—Real case with respect to that Bp.—II. Even supposing the threat true, the supposed conclusion (91) would not follow.—Difference between Kitchin's and Barlow's cases.—The other Consecrators not threatened.—92. According to Champney, on whose testimony the threat rests, *Scory*, not *Barlow*, was the Consecrator.—Dilemma.—93. Conclusion.

CHAPTER VI.

There was nothing essential wanting either as to the matter or as to the form in the Consecration of Parker.

93. General maxims.—94. Imposition of hands the only essential *matter* of Ordination.—Unction,—Book of the Gospels, &c.—95. Variety in ceremonies.—Renaudot.—*Form* of Ordination.—96. The words *Accipe* &c. not used in the East, and not before modern times in the West.—Uniform prayers (97) not found in different Churches.—*Prayer in general* the only essential *form* of Ordination.—98. Council of Trent.—General statement.—Matter and form.—99. Both retained in the English Ordinal.—Vicissitudes of that Ordinal.—Its contents.—Imposition of hands.—Records of English Consecrations:—Parker.—100. Omitted ceremonies:—not essential.—Morinus.—101. Objection of Renaudot.—'Unknown form':—discussion.—102. Eastern Rituals.—English case the same.—Eastern independence.—Previous submission of the English.—They retain their liberty.—The service itself.—103. Prayers in the English Ordinal.—The Pontifical.—104. Question in the English Ordinal.—Second Invocation (*Accipe* &c).—Conclusion.

CHAPTER VII.

Continuation of the same subject. Answer to the difficulties. The alterations made by Charles the Second in the Ritual of Edward the Sixth do not prove that there was any essential defect in the Ordination of Parker.

105. Summing up.—Objection of Renaudot:—the words “*Take the Holy Ghost*” equally suitable to Bishops and Priests:—106. additions made in consequence.—Answer.—I. The fact false; the whole formulæ having been already different.—107. The additions made only for fuller explanation.—This proved by two reasons.—II. The principle also false.—1. The validity of Ordination does not depend on this particular formula:—(a) because the use of the formula itself is modern in the West, while in the East it neither is nor ever has been used:—108. (b) because the validity of the Sacraments does not in any case depend on certain words rather than the rest, unless these have been determined by our Saviour.—109. Every Church has power to draw up her own Ritual.—2. The validity of this particular formula does not depend on the addition; for the addition itself is wanting as well in the Roman as in all the other Ordination Services.—110. Objection.—Answer.—The formula as well determined by the rest of the Service in the Edwardine as in the Roman Ritual.—Particulars.—Ordination of Priests.—111. Ordination of Bishops.—112. The Roman Pontifical compared.—The addition:—summing up.—113. Jesuit Divines.—Error of Renaudot.—Objection.—114. Answer.—Renaudot not charged wrongly.—The other hypothesis, however, untenable.—Some things mere ceremonies.—115. Summing up.

CHAPTER VIII.

Answer to the second difficulty [see p. 105]. The Form of Ordination prescribed by Edward the Sixth was not proscribed by Law when Parker was consecrated.

116. Objection:—‘King Edward’s Ritual prohibited by Law at the time of Parker’s ‘Ordination.’—This proved by the indictment of Bonner by Horn,—(117) and the conduct of the Judges and Parliament with respect to that case.—Answer.—What is agreed.—118. Bonner’s Counsel.—Two pleas.—What is not agreed.—The first fact false.—119. Stapleton’s reasoning.—120. The second plea most insisted on.—The fact false.—Statutes: 2 and 3 Ed. 6. c. 1.—3 and 4 Ed. 6. c. 12.—5 and 6 Ed. 6. c. 1.—(Sect. V. given in full),—(121) 1 Mar. Sess. 2. c. 2.—(122) 1 Eliz. c. 2.—(123) 8 Eliz. c. 1.—Result.—Cause of the difficulty.—124. The Ordinal part of the Prayer-book,—(Heylin,)—(125) and as such restored with it.—Table of Contents of the Prayer-book.—Words of the Statute of 1552.—Way in which it was understood.—126. Heylin’s statement.—The 36th Article:—argument thence:—127. Burnet’s remarks.—Further arguments:—Ordination, if not regarded as a Sacrament, at least included in “the rites and ceremonies of the Church”.—Argument from what the Statute of Mary had repealed.—128. Heylin.—Its re-establishment acknowledged by Roman Catholics:—Sanders,—Bossuet,—(129) Jesuits.—Statute of 1662:—130. argument thence.—Objection:—why discharge Bonner?—Answer.—declaration of Convocation:—of Parliament.—131. Bonner and the rest had suffered sufficiently:—moderation of the Queen.—Objection:—decision of Sir Robert Brooke.—132. Observation of Champney.—Answer:—real case.—133. Brooke’s opinion given under Mary:—died before Elizabeth came to the Crown.—Abstract from the Grand Abridgement.—Champney’s “bad faith”.—134. Objections.—Answers: subject of the Act of 1597;—(135) English custom as to reprinting Law-books.—136. Obj.:—the dispensing clause:—the notice taken of it in the Act of 1566.—137. Answer.—1. The clause not used in any of the Ordinations before 1566 except Parker’s.—2. Doctrine of Anglicans as to Royal dispensations.—3. What the Queen undertook to supply.—

4. (138) Use made of the clause.—Act of Confirmation.—(139.) 5. Probable object of the clause:—Barlow, Scory, and Coverdale had been deprived in Mary's reign and never canonically restored:—terms of the dispensing clause itself.—The clause not found in the first Commission.—6. Absolutions *ad cautelam*.—Conclusion.—140. Statute of 1566:—five things which it does according to Mason.—Objection answered.

CHAPTER IX.

Answer to the third difficulty. The heretical opinions of some of those employed in drawing up the Form of Ordinations appointed by Edward the Sixth, are not sufficient to invalidate the Ordinations performed according to this Form.

141. Vain efforts of objectors.—New objection:—Cranmer and Barlow in notorious error on the subject of Orders.—Their answers to certain questions.—142. Qu. 12, 13, 14, 4 &c., 7, 9.—Result.—Cranmer imbibed these opinions in Germany and communicated them to others:—to Barlow among the first:—charge against Barlow in 1536.—143. Objection pressed.—144. Answer.—I. Fact:—the majority of the Commissioners differed:—who the Commissioners were.—144. Their answers to the same list of questions.—Qu. 7, 9, 11, 12, (145) 14.—Result.—Cranmer over-ruled.—So in the case of the Six Articles.—Policy of the Committee.—146. Of Queen Elizabeth.—Summing up.—Cranmer's views not fixed.—II. (147.) The argument unsound.—Reasons.—1. The inward intention of the Minister does not affect the validity of a Sacrament, it being necessary only that he should intend to do what the Church does, and do it as a religious ceremony.—2. The intention is to be judged of only by the outward behaviour.—149. If the changes do not alter the substance of the form, it ought still to be regarded as the work of the Church.—Example of the ancient Church.—150. Arian Baptism.—Baptism of the Reformed.—Other Sacraments.—151. Obj.:—'the form entirely changed in the 'English Ritual, which was also drawn up in opposition to the Church.'—Answer.—The fact not true with respect to the change.—Were it true, it would not prove the point.—Words of Father Alexander.—Baptism.—152. English followed the Canons of the Council of Carthage.—Objection answered.—Reproaches of Calvin.—153. Objection answered:—all others who have separated from the Church by heresy or schism have also lifted the standard against her.—Antiquity:—next Chapter.

CHAPTER X.

Examination into the power of a national Church in the administration of the Sacraments; and whether by the changes she makes in their form she prejudices their validity, even when she does not make them until after she has fallen into schism or heresy.

154. Summing up.—Power of national Churches.—General usage.—155. Syriac Liturgies.—Two classes of Sacraments.—Those of the second variable in form.—Examples.—Penance.—Greek forms compared together.—Those of Gabriel of Philadelphia, —(156) of the Barberine Library,—of John the Monk,—and of John the Faster.—Greek and Latin forms compared.—157. Objection.—Answer.—These forms do not relate to mere relaxations of censures or interdicts, but to the proper Sacrament:—this proved by the Offices themselves.—Other Sacraments.—158. Extreme Unction.—Greek and Latin forms compared.—Different Latin forms compared.—159. Further considerations.—Matrimony.—Conclusion.*

* It will perhaps be observed that the remainder of the Epitome of the text is considerably fuller than the preceding portion:—this may partially (perhaps) be accounted for by a difference in the nature of the matter; but, at all events, a period of about two years and a half having intervened between the drawing up of what precedes and of what follows, it will not appear at all surprising that, in resuming after so long an interval, a different ratio of compression should have been fallen into. The reader, however, will be a considerable gainer by the increased fulness of the following portion.

160. Reason of the case.—I. Discipline: liberty of particular Churches:—(decrees of the Council of Trent *on the subject of discipline* not received in France.)—161. Objection:—‘particular Churches cannot alter important points.’—Answer:—the principle not altogether true:—if true it would prove only schism, not nullity.—162. Obj.:—‘the matter and form of the Sacraments sacred.’—Ans.:—the matter and form not invariable:—explanation of Boyvin:—162. Divines quoted by him:—Cardinal Bona:—principle laid down by Courayer: things which have not been always and everywhere may be changed.—164. Application of this principle.—II. Extent of the authority of the Church of Rome.—165. Letter of St. Gregory.—Ancient book on the Sacraments.—Effects of this principle:—varieties:—166. Fulbert of Chartres:—Gerson:—Rome, according to Walafridus Strabo, has adopted from the Offices of the Gallican Church:—those who have adopted the Roman Offices have not deprived themselves of the power of making changes:—this power exercised both in the refusal to adopt the changes made by Rome in her Pontifical in 1645 and in the restoration of abandoned usages:—St. Augustine:—Ernulphus Roffensis.—167. Two difficulties.—Answer to the second:—forms not determined by Scripture variable:—Cardinal Bona:—Morinus:—168. Answer to the first difficulty:—the right of inspection possessed by Rome not unlimited:—Council of Trent:—169. Armenians and Maronites.—An objection answered.—Limits to the power of Rome.—170. Difference between *ought* and *can*.—English changes not in essentials.—Quotations from Father Alexander.—171. III. Variations in the Roman formulæ.—Epistle of the Bp of Pianza with respect to the Roman Pontifical of 1485.—172. Difference of ancient and modern forms of Penance, Orders, and Marriage.—Boyvin &c.—Inference.—173. IV. No written formulæ at first.—What follows.

Conclusion.—Objection:—‘power lost by schism.’—Answer:—practice:—Renaudot:—(174.) Syriac Liturgies &c.—Armenian Eucharist.—175. An objection answered.—Facts.—Variations in the Eucharistic Office.—The Canon.—Our Saviour’s words.—Variations in the Syriac Liturgy of Matthew the Pastor, (176.) The Liturgies of Thomas of Heraclea, Dionysius Barsalibi, that which bears the name of St. Xystus, and the second attributed to St. Peter.—Lesser variations:—Ethiopic Liturgy.—177. These changes made after separation.—178. Variations in Ordination:—date of Rituals.—179. Other Sacraments.—Conclusion.—Terms of reunion talked of for these Eastern Sects.—Objection met.—180. Consequences:—1. The same power ought not to have been contested with the Anglican Church:—2. The Ordinations of that Church cannot be taxed with invalidity.—Proof of the first.—181. Of the second.—Two difficulties.—Answer to the first: it is not true that we cannot prove the composition or alteration of the Liturgies or forms by schismatical bodies.—182. Explanation of the second:—admitted “that what is done by a schismatical Church is illicitly and illegitimately done, as St. Augustine says”:—all that is contended is that this illegitimacy does not affect the validity of the Sacraments.—183. Objection: ‘the argument proves too much.’—Answer:—the question has been, not what could be done legitimately, even by Catholic Churches, but only what could be done validly:—184. Anglican or even pure Calvinistic Baptism received.—Another objection met.—Conclusion.

CHAPTER XI.

Answer to the fourth difficulty [see p. 105]. *It was not by the secular, but by the Ecclesiastical authority, that the Anglican Ritual was altered.*

P. 185. This difficulty but little urged.—Objection:—‘it was not the Anglican Church ‘but the secular power which changed the ancient usages:—all therefore that has been ‘done in consequence is null.’—186. Answer:—the fact untrue:—the new Form drawn up by spiritual persons.—Heylin.—Burnet.—187. Collier.—Names of compilers.—No subsequent approbation by Parliament required before acting upon it. Words of the Act.

—188. Inference. Objection:—‘spiritual power granted the King’:—Act of 1535:—1 El. c. 1:—189. use made of this power.—Answer: concession:—what is denied.—190. Proofs.—Art. 37.—Canon 2 of 1603.—Convocation of 1640.—191. Queen Elizabeth’s Injunctions of 1559.—192. Apology of James I.—Statutes restrained by the sense put upon them.—Mocket.—194. Bramhall.—195. Burnet.—Brett.—Result.—196. Admission:—limitation:—Bramhall: besides that the Stat. 25 Hen. 8. c. 21 “ought not to be imputed to the Anglican Church, since Henry VIII was not then a Protestant”; most probably “only the exercise of the Ecclesiastical jurisdiction in the outer court” was intended: Commissions.—197. Inference from the Statute itself.—Doctrine of the Anglican Divines:—Mocket:—James I:—Mason.—The Presbyterian School to be distinguished.—The extravagancies of that party disavowed by the Anglican Church.—199. Authorized doctrine of that Church.—“All that can be concluded at most from these excesses is, that the Bishops cannot acquire or confer any lawful jurisdiction in a Church where the King usurps such a jurisdiction.”—Clergy included in the Parliament.—What that Assembly does.—200. Conclusion.

(PART OR VOLUME II OF THE ORIGINAL.)

CHAPTER XII.

Answer to the fifth difficulty [see p. 102]. *The doubts of the Divines who regard the English Ordinations as null are not sufficient to make them dubious, nor consequently invalid.*

P. 201. Objection from doubt:—Champney.—202. Answer: St. Leo.—203. The novelty of the form no solid objection.—Morinus.—Habert.—204. Goar, Hallier, and others.—Habert.—The form of the Sacrament does not consist in certain words to the exclusion of the rest.—205. Morinus.—Want of authority in the Church which introduced the new rite:—this objection met in Chap. 10.—206. The changes shewn in the sixth and following Chapters not to be essential.—Objection: ‘these Ordinations have never been recognized by Catholics.’—Answer.—Causes.—207. Doubts must have some foundation.—Doubt with respect to the Greek Ordinations in 1639.—No foundation for such doubt in the Anglican alterations of the Form.—Doubt with respect to Barlow.—This difficulty met in Chapters 3, 4, and 5.—No reasonable doubt remains:—arguments to shew this, viz.:—1. Long silence.—2. Grounds of objection insufficient.—209. 3. Contrast of these grounds with the evidences on the other side.—Improbabilities in supposing Barlow not to have been ordained.—210. Shifting of the ground.—Nag’s-head fable:—form:—Barlow.—211. Objection of Champney.—Answer.—212. Parallel opposite argument.—Doubts to be distinguished.—213. Summing up.

Two objections of the Journal de Trevoux of April 1722.—I. ‘Divines being divided as to the sufficiency of imposition of hands and prayer alone, it can never be regarded as certain.’—214. Answer:—facts, not reasonings, to be followed.—215. Objection.—Answer.—216. Proofs.—217. Doubts endless.

II. Second difficulty. ‘The Episcopal presupposes the Sacerdotal Ordination, whereas the Anglicans, who so far from giving in their Ordinations, reject as chimerical, the power of consecrating and sacrificing the adorable Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, have no true Priests among them.’—218. This difficulty as old as Champney.—Used by the writer as a kind of subsidiary reason.—All its propositions false or very uncertain.—219. 1. The Episcopal does not necessarily presuppose the Sacerdotal Ordination.—Authorities which, according to our author, prove his point:—Bellarmine:—Jerome, &c.:—Zosimus:—examples.—220. The assumption unfair.—2. The Priesthood not conferred by the formula which expresses the power of sacrificing.—This formula not used in the East:—221. nor anciently in the Latin Church.—The Anglican Divines (among

many others William and John Forbes, Mason, Bp Andrewes, Thorndike, Jos. Mead, and Grabe) allow *a representative and commemorative Sacrifice*.—Quotations :—Andrewes :—John Forbes :—222. Grabe :—223. Comparison of the language, 1. of the Fathers.—St. Chrysostom.—Eusebius of Casarea.—224. St. Augustine.—St. Ignatius, Tertullian, St. Cyprian, St. Ambrose, and the Fathers in general.—(225) 2. Of the Old Catholic Divines.—The Master of the Sentences (Peter Lombard) :—St. Thomas Aquinas.—Hugo de Sancto Victore, Nicolas Lyra, and the greater part of the old Schoolmen.—226. Cardinal Gropper, Cassander, Barnes, Ferus, and after them the Bishops of Belley (Camus) and Meaux (Bossuet), Father Veron, and others went no farther.—Particulars.—Bossuet :—Camus :—Veron :—Vasquez.—Observation.—227. Power of sacrificing involved in the Anglican Ordination Service.—Further proof of this.—Parker, at all events, had been ordained Priest according to the Roman Pontifical.—228. Concluding observation.

CHAPTER XIII.

Answer to the sixth difficulty [see p. 105]. The re-ordinations of some English Bishops cannot be made to prove that there was any thing essential wanting in their Ordination.

P. 228. Objection of Renaudot : ‘ Under both Mary and Elizabeth those ordained ‘ according to Edward VI’s Ritual treated as mere laymen by the Catholics.’—Answer :—the facts true ;—but the proceedings under Mary not very uniform,—Latimer, Ridley, and Farrar, who had been made Bishops according to the Roman Pontifical, having been degraded from the Priesthood only.*—Quotation from Collier with respect to Latimer and Ridley :—230. with respect to Farrar.—Burnet.—231. Instructions of Mary.—Objection.—Answer.—Visitation questions of Bonner.—232. Extract from a Bull of Julius III. to Cardinal Pole.—234. Remarks upon it.—Continuation of the extract.—235. Alleged offer of Pius IV to Elizabeth.—General deduction.

As for the opinions of the Divines who object to the Ordinations of Elizabeth, their reasons depend on two false facts, viz. :—1. according to those of the earliest date,—that they were contrary to the laws and performed by those who were not Bishops themselves :—2. according to the later Divines, on account of the Nag’s-head story.—237. The second of these facts already proved false.—Also the first.—Stapleton, Harding, and other Catholic writers, it is true, denied them to be Bishops,—238. but upon what grounds?—Because, as Harding says, they had been ordained by schismatic Bishops, and a defective rite, even Parker himself not having been consecrated by lawful Bishops.—239. Mistaken notion of those times as to the necessity of the unction, the imposition of the book of the Gospels, and the delivery of the instruments.—Such a view no ground of argument.—240. On the whole, the opinions of these Divines rest either on the false fact of the Nag’s-head Ordination, or on the error of re-ordaining those ordained in schism or heresy, or on the mistaken notion just mentioned.

The practice of the Church of Rome not uniform, as appears by the Bull of Julius III (see p. 232—235),—nor founded on any juridical and solemn examination of the question,—but owing to the statements, founded on false facts and unsound principles, of the English Catholics.—This confirmed by a letter of M. Fontanini.—241. Former irregularities at Rome.—Case of Formosus (ob. 897).—Of Constantine (intruded 767) :—242. Extract from Anastasius the Librarian. True, as Auxilius (on the Ordinations of Formosus) has observed, we must not argue from bad examples :—243. and accordingly the author concludes only, “ that what is done at Rome is not always the rule of what “ we ought to do”.—More regard therefore to be had, according to St. Augustine’s maxim,

* In the case, however, of Latimer and Ridley, at least, this was contrary to the Commission of Cardinal Pole. See more p. 228 A (i. e. p. 228, parag. 1).

to reason than to examples.—Objection.—Answer.—244. Motives.—French and other Bishops not likely to have decided merely from passion (in the case of Constantine).—Quotation from Sigebert with respect to the case of Formosus.

CHAPTER XIV.

Continuation of the same subject. The re-ordinations of the English are contrary to all the principles now received in the Schools on the subject of re-ordinations.

P. 245. Former doubts on the general question.—Now dispersed.—Reasons.—First received principle :—Sacraments impressing *character* are not to be reiterated ;—St. Augustine.—Second principle :—the conferring of a Sacrament out of the Church does not render it null.—247. St. Augustine.—Optatus.—Third principle :—the case of Ordination the same with that of Baptism.—This maxim not always universally received :—Urban II.—Gratian.—Ground of the comparison.—249. Fourth principle :—to reiterate a Sacrament there must either be a positive decree of the Church, or a clear nullity, or a solid and evident doubt.—St. Leo the Great.—Fifth principle :—in Ordination, as in the other Sacraments, many things are non-essential.—Morinus wrong in maintaining that things not necessarily essential, if omitted contrary to the commands of the Church, render an Ordination null.—250. Application of these principles :—251. first and second :—fifth :—third :—252. fourth :—no decree of the Church against the Anglican Ordinations :—no evident nullity :—no sufficient doubt.—253. Summing up.—Two alternatives :—it must be shewn either that the essentials were not observed, or that Morinus's principle is sound.—The first position indefensible.—254. Examination of Morinus's principle with respect to the omission of ceremonies.—Morinus, according to our author, inconsistent.—Question itself.—Distinction of cases.—255. 1. The principle of Morinus true when the omission is such as to manifest a want of the intention of doing what the Church does ; —2. not when it arises from necessity, or the like.—256. Examples.—Baptism.—Orders :—Ordinations by one Bishop (in case of necessity) admitted in numerous instances.—3. Neither is Ordination invalid when the omission is directed by the Church, either general or particular.—257. Admission of Morinus.—His maxim must be restricted to the first of these three cases.—Cause of his error, a second maxim that the Church has power to determine the conditions of Ordination in such sort that if they be neglected, the act may be null.—258. This principle only partially true.—At all events it cannot apply to things which have not been prescribed under such penalty.—Argument.—Further argument.—259. The cases of Matrimony and Penance, alleged by Morinus, inapplicable ; Sacraments which do not imprint *character* (i. e. all except Baptism, Confirmation, and Orders) being null whenever they are unlawful.—Matrimony.—260. Penance.—Inference.—Negative argument.—Positive :—the Council of Trent distinguishes between the essentials and the rites and ceremonies of the Sacraments.—261. Objection.—Answer.—262. Further observation.—Remarks with respect to the present practice of the Church of Rome.

CHAPTER XV.

Continuation of the same subject. How much the Church has varied with respect to re-ordinations. Reflections on a principle proposed by Mr. Thorndike to fix these variations, and to regulate this matter. It is not upon this principle that the Church has hitherto regulated her conduct on this head.

P. 263. Vicissitudes of principles :—Pascal.—Observation.—The principles against reiteration reducible to two :—1. That a Sacrament administered out of the Church is not therefore null.—2. That we must reason about Ordination as about Baptism.—264. These two maxims have been disputed.—Vicissitudes of the first as applied to Baptism.—St. Cyprian and the Churches of Africa.—265. Felix of Misgirpa.—Januarius Muzu-

lensis.—Pelagius of Luperciana.—Orientals, even posterior to the Council of Nice:—Firmilian:—St. Athanasius, St. Cyril of Jerusalem, St. Basil, and others.—266. Against Ordination out of the Church the case still stronger.—Innocent I.—267. Second Council of Saragossa:—remark.—268. Council of Rome (A.D. 769) on the business of Constantine, and Second of Soissons (A.D. 853) on that of Ebbo.—Answers in the Oriental Law,—1. of a Patriarch of Constantinople to Martyrius Patriarch of Antioch,—and 2. of Balsamon to a Patriarch of Alexandria,—adduced by Morinus.—269. Urban II.—Divines of the time of Cardinal Peter Damian, who however is of a different opinion himself.—270. Facts.—(Observation of Auxilius.)—Council of Nice, A.D. 325.—Council of Constantinople, A.D. 381, as interpreted by Balsamon and Zonaras.—Case of Photius ordained A.D. 858:—271. words of Adrian II:—of Anastasius the Librarian:—of Nicolas I:—272. of Adrian II:—of the Eighth General Council (the Fourth of Constantinople) A.D. 869.—Observation: temporary reconciliation under John VIII, A.D. 879:—variations.—273. Cases of Constantine, Ebbo, and Formosus.—1. Of Constantine:—extract from Anastasius.—(274) 2. Of Ebbo:—second Council of Soissons.—3. Of Formosus.—Conclusion.

Principle proposed by Mr. Thorndike for the explanation and settlement of these variations.—Extract.—276. Observations, chiefly explanatory:—first:—277. second:—third:—278. fourth:—fifth:—279. sixth.—Summing up:—more to be said against this principle than for it.—On the whole, there has been little uniformity on this head, but “if the principle now received in the Catholic Schools holds good, we cannot dispute “with the English the validity of their Ordination.”

CHAPTER XVI.

The Succession of the English Bishops has not been interrupted by the Schism.

P. 280. The author does not undertake to prove the Anglican Bishops legitimate.—What is wanting to make them lawful Bishops.—General argument.—Grounds of early objectors,—281. while the Nag's-head story “was not as yet born”.

Four epochs of danger to the Anglican Succession.—I. Henry VIII.—No difficulty in his reign.—Sanders.—Act of the first year of Mary.—Bishops consecrated after the Schism.—Several continued in their Sees without re-ordination.

II. Edward VI.—The Rite altered; the number of the Ordainers preserved.—Two remarks.—1. Twenty-six Sees in England [and Wales];—yet only six Bishops ordained by the new Rite;—284. the first June 29. 1550, the last May 26. 1553.—2. The new Rite valid.—Admission of Cardinal Pole.—285. Facts proving it to have been admitted.—

III. Elizabeth.—This epoch insisted on with the greatest earnestness.—The old Bishops entirely wanting.—286. Other difficulties.—Conditional admission.—Differences amongst objectors.—287. Answer by way of recapitulation.—1. Nag's-head story.—288. 2. Barlow truly consecrated.—Anglicans in the case of the Donatists, &c.—3. The new Form valid.—What must be proved to make it invalid.—289. All these propositions false.—Result.—4. Parker ordained according to the new Rite, and by a consecrated Bishop.—Summing up.

IV. (290.) Cromwell.—No difficulty.—His policy. End of his projects.—Nine of the old Bishops alive in 1660.—291. Who these were.—New Ordinations.—General objection:—want of lawful right.—“1. Because the greater part were ordained during the “life of the true Bishops, without their consent.—2. Because they occupied their Sees in “virtue of a vicious title, that is to say, in virtue of provisions granted by a lay and “excommunicated prince.—3. Because they are themselves notoriously excommunicated “and irregular.”—Answer:—admission:—what the real question is;—viz. whether or not a succession of the substance of Orders has been so preserved among them as that by reconciliation with the Church what is faulty in their vocation may be corrected.—292.

Other separated bodies.—Case of the Donatists compared.—Cause of the practice adopted at Rome.—Letter of M. Fontanini.

CHAPTER XVII.

Conclusion and Recapitulation of this Treatise.

P. 293. Impartiality with which the author professes to have treated the question.—Recapitulation.—Re-ordinations always odious.—Parker the stem of the new Ministry.—His Consecrator (Barlow) was consecrated himself.—294. The contrary never maintained during Parker's life.—The new Ritual does not differ in essentials from the Roman Pontifical.—The Nag's-head story utterly indefensible.—295. The Ordination therefore not invalid in itself.—Other alleged grounds of nullity.—These refuted.—Spiritual authority in England.—Quotation from Bramhall.—296. The Ordination Service reformed by Ecclesiastics.—Powers of a national Church.—Schism does not alter the case.—297. The re-ordination of the English is therefore indefensible.—What alterations make a Sacrament null:—Natalis Alexander.—298. The doubt therefore without foundation.—Comparison of the argument on the two sides.—Succession.—299. General observations: tendency of the Work.—Conclusion.

(AUTHOR'S APPENDIX.)

PROOFS ESTABLISHING THE FACTS ADVANCED IN THIS TREATISE.

ARTICLE I.

[† *Translation of*] a letter from the late M. J. Ben. Bossuet, Bishop of Meaux, to Dom John Mabillon. (P. 301, 302.)

In this letter, amongst other things, a favourable opinion is expressed of the Anglican Ordinations.

ARTICLE II.

Various Statutes [i. e. Acts, or portions of Acts,] of Parliament, of which mention has been made in this Work. P. 302—311.

- § 1. Act of 1535 (26 Henry 8, c. 1) declaring the King Head of the Church of England. P. 302
- § 2. Statute of 1534 (25 Hen. 8, c. 21, § 3) concerning the necessity of applying to the Abp of Canterbury, or to some Bishop, to have dispensations.—Notice of, and deduction from, Sections 4, 5, and 17. 303

Statutes concerning the Consecration of Bishops.

- § 3. Statute of 1534 (25 Hen. 8, c. 20, § 5—7) on this subject. Part of § 5 is omitted. 304

Statutes for the Book of Consecration of Bishops [§c.] made under Edward the Sixth in the Parliaments of 1549 and 1552.

- § 4. Act of 1549 (3 and 4 Ed. 6, c. 12) to order the drawing up of the new Form. (From Rastal's Abridgment) 306
- § 5. Statute of 1552 (5 and 6 Ed. 6, c. 1, § 5) to annex the Book of Ordination to that of Common Prayer 306
- § 6. Act of 1553 (1 Mary, Sess. 2, c. 2) for the repeal of the two preceding Acts. (From Rastal's Abridgment.) 307

§ 7. Statute of 1559 (1 Eliz. c. 2, § 1—3) for the restoration of the Book of Common Prayer.	307
§ 8. Statute of 1566 (8 Eliz. c. 2, § 1—5) touching the validity of the Ordinations made since 1559. (Of § 2 the purport only is given)—Inference.	308
§ 9. Act of 1597 (39 Eliz. c. 8) to confirm the deposition of the old Bishops and other Dignitaries, and the substitution of the new ones.—Inference.	310

ARTICLE III.

Extract from the Book of Common Prayer, and from the Formulary of Ordinations, which was joined to it by a Statute of the Parliament of the year 1552. (P. 311—321.)

[Editor's note concerning the omission of this whole Article in both Mr. Williams's Editions, in consequence of his having mistaken the Ordination Service of Edward VI in spite both of the title and the introduction, for that of Charles II!]

Introduction, p. 311, 312.—The Edwardine Form of Ordering Priests, 312—317.—Of Bishops, 318—321.—(Of the Epistles and Gospels only the beginnings and endings are given.)

N.B. Of these Forms, instead of the Latin translation of which our author had made use, the present Editor has given the original English,—preserving however at the foot of p. 312, 313, the original Latin of the hymn *Veni Creator*. [See more in his Notes.]

ARTICLE IV.

Alterations made in the Ritual under Charles the Second. (P. 321—323.)

§ 1. Changes made in the Ordination of Priests.	321
§ 2. Changes made in the Ordination of Bishops.	323

ARTICLE V.

General authority given by Pope Julius the Third to Cardinal Pole for reconciling England to the Church of Rome. (P. 323—327.)

Inference from the Bull.	327
----------------------------------	-----

ARTICLE VI.

A Collection of Records concerning Parker. (P. 328—336.)

Introduction, p. 328.—§ 1. Elizabeth's first Letters Patent for the Confirmation and Consecration of Parker, 328.—§ 2. Her second ditto, with an introduction, and the judgment of six Canonists with respect to the clause *Supplentes* at the end of the letter, 329.—§ 3. Confirmation of the Election of Parker by the consecrating Bishops, 330.—§ 4. Record of Parker's Consecration taken from the Registers of the Church of Canterbury, and from Corpus Christi College Library at Cambridge, together with two certificates, and the mention of some other documents, 332.—§ 5. Copy of a certificate of the verification for our author of the Record of Parker's Consecration in Bramhall's Works with the Registers at Lambeth. (The original of this Certificate was deposited by our author in the copy of Bramhall in the King's Library at Paris.) P. 335.

ARTICLE VII.

Attestations against the fable of Parker's Consecration in a Tavern.* (P. 336—339.)

§ 1. Attestation of the Bishop of Durham, [with the Certificate of the Notary.]	336
§ 2. Certificate of some [† other] Bishops.	338

* Rather, *Attestations against the statement that Dr. Morton, Bishop of Durham, had asserted in Parliament a modified version of the Nag's-head story.*

§ 3. Certificate of some Peers.	339
§ 4. Certificate of the Clerk of the Parliament.	<i>ib.</i>

ARTICLE VIII.

Records concerning Barlow. (P. 339—346.)

Introduction.	339
§ 1. Commission to consecrate Barlow, dated Feb. 22. 153 $\frac{2}{3}$	<i>ib.</i>
§ 2. Writ for the restitution of the temporalities of St. David's, Ap. 26. 1536	340
§ 3. Parliamentary Writs (not in full) for 1536, in which Barlow is mentioned	<i>ib.</i>
§ 4. Ditto for 1541, in which he is named before many Bishops certainly consecrated.	341
§ 5. <i>Congé d'élire</i> for St. Asaph, after the translation of Barlow, dated May 29. 1536.	<i>ib.</i>
§ 6. Commission (not in full) to consecrate Warton for St. Asaph, dated June 24. 1536.—Mention of Cranmer's Commission (in 154 $\frac{1}{2}$) to consecrate Bulkeley, directed among others to Barlow.	<i>ib.</i>
§ 7. Writ of nomination to the Bishopric of Bath and Wells, dated Feb. 26. 154 $\frac{1}{2}$, with an introduction stating that it is inserted entire "because it is the first given in Rymer's Collection by which it appears that the King had appropriated to himself the nomination of Bishops, taking away from the Chapters the right of Election", and a mention of three other deeds which presuppose Barlow's consecration "by the proof they furnish of the possession he enjoyed of the temporalities of the Church of Bath".	342
§ 8. <i>Congé d'élire</i> for Bath and Wells, vacant by the resignation of Barlow, dated Mar. 13. 155 $\frac{3}{4}$	343
§ 9. Commission of Mary to consecrate Barlow's successor (Bourne) to Bath and Wells, dated Mar. 28. 1554.—Remark.	344
§ 10. Writ for the restitution of the temporalities of Bath and Wells, dated Ap. 20. 1554.—Remark.	<i>ib.</i>
§ 11. Commission to confirm Barlow in the See of Chichester, dated Dec. 18. 1559, with a Certificate (dated June 19, 1721, but which does not appear in the French Edition: see Mr. Williams's Preface, p. 10 A.) of the verification of this Record, and an observation with respect to Rymer's error in transcribing it.	345
§ 12. Writ for the restitution of the temporalities of Chichester, granted to Barlow, Mar. 27. 1560.—Remark.	346

ARTICLE IX.

Fragments of letters written to the author. (P. 345—364.)

These extensive fragments of the two Latin letters (or two parts of one Latin letter: see the Editor's Introduction, p. xvii, note c) written by the learned Abp Wake to our author, relate throughout to the Consecration of Barlow, but contain at the same time a variety of important and interesting matter, of most of which, as well as of the contents of the same Prelate's English letters (see the same note), free use has been made in the text of this Work.

(MR. WILLIAMS'S APPENDIX.)

- N^o 1. A paragraph (in the original French) for which our author directed another (which see p. 62, 63) to be substituted: see Mr. Williams's Preface, p. 10 A.—Addition within brackets, by the Editor. P. 365, 366
- N^o 2. The title of Chap. 15 as it stood in the French Edition, but for which he directed that at the head of p. 263 to be substituted. (Compare N^o 3.) 366
- N^o 3. The conclusion of Chap. 15 as it stood in the French Edition, but for which,

“lest” (says Mr. Williams) “he should be thought to espouse Mr. Thorndike’s principles about re-ordination”, he directed the one beginning on p. 275 to be substituted. 366—368

MR. WILLIAMS’S INDEX. (P. 369—374.)

(In the Editor’s foot-notes to d°,—p. 369. Mr. Williams’s own Work on the Anglican Succession:—the Defence of the present Work:—372. Neale.

THE EDITOR’S FURTHER NOTES*.

Among the subjects treated of in these Notes, besides corrections and translations (see Introd. p. xii), are:—In the notes to p. 1, Mr. Williams.—To p. 5, his Preface:—p. 10, the alterations he was authorised to make:—his translations of quotations.—11-16, the author’s letter to him.—17, Mason.—“The Anglican Church”.—25, Richard Creagh.

Chap. I. To p. 32, Statutes at large.—New Ordinal.—33. Scotch Presbyterian Ministers.—34. John Knox.—Superintendents.—35. Lives of the Kings and Queens of England.—37. Remnant of the Anglican Church in Scotland.

Chap. II. P. 39. *Compromise*.—41. Bramhall’s Works.—43. Bluet.—Neale.—48. Abp Wake.—52. Stapleton.—53. Stow.

Chap. III, 60. Robert King, first Bp of Oxford.—61. Strype.—63. Author’s corrections.—Process of making a Bishop.—64. Daniel Pulteney.

Chap. IV. 72. Suffragan or Titular Bishops:—Strype and Wharton:—Henrician Suffragans.—82. Instruments of Investiture.

Chap. VII. 110, &c. Quotations from the Anglican Ordinal:—mistake of our author.

Chap. VIII. 116. Bonner.—119. Feckenham.—120, &c. *Statutes* of Parliament.—128. Making Bishops.—132, &c. Quotation of Champney’s:—Ward.

Chap. IX. 141. Barlow.—142. Questions.—Heretical opinions of Cranmer and Barlow with respect to Consecration.—Also of one Talley.—143. Compilers of the new Ordinal.—144, &c. The other Bishops not of the opinion of Cranmer and Barlow.—147. Declaration.—151. Forms of Sacraments.

Chap. X. 156, &c. Blunders of Mr. Williams.—160. “Roman Catholic”.—177. Disciples.

Chap. XI. 192 and 197. Works of James I.—198. Royal abasement of Episcopacy.—199. Votes of Bishops in Parliament.

(Vol. II.) Chap. XII. 226. Edward Sheldon.

Chap. XIII. 238. Harding.—241. Dates of certain Popes.—242. Passage from Anastasius the Librarian:—various readings:—Baronius:—Anastasius’s use of the pluperfect.

Chap. XIV. 253. St. Leo.—254. Morinus: what he really maintains.

Chap. XV. 265. Council of Carthage.—St. Felix.—Heretical Baptism:—St. Athanasius:—St. Basil:—Pepuzeni.—268. Subdeacons and Psaltanagnosts.—Greek Responses concerning heretical Orders.—270. *χειροθετείν*.—Maximus the Cynic.—271. Photius: Ignatius:—272. Words of Nicolas I, Innocent I, Formosus, and Adrian II.—273. Anastasius the Librarian:—various readings:—his use of the pluperfect.—275-279. Author’s alterations in the passage concerning the system of Thorndike:—plan pursued with respect to them.

Chap. XVI. 281. Author’s mistake with respect to Sanders.—284. Edwardine Ordinal.—290. Cromwell.—291. Bishops who survived, and Bishops who were ordained immediately after, the Rebellion.

Chap. XVII. 296. Bramhall.

* The figures at the head of the last xlii pages of the volume should rather have been in italics.

AUTHOR'S APPENDIX:—PROOFS. P. 301. *Virtù*.—302. Statutes at large.—Old spelling.—303. Dispensations: power allowed the Bishops.—304. State mode of dealing with them:—305. English use of Latin participles.—*Corporal* oath.—*Chapiter*.—306. The diphthongs *æ* and *œ*.—*Then* and *than*.—312. English original and Latin translation of the Edwardine Ordination Service.—Old English spelling, pronunciation, and metre.—Dr. Cardwell's Edition of Edward the Sixth's Prayer-Books.—The spelling of Grafton's older than that of Whitechurche's impressions.—312, 313. Hymn *Veni Creator*:—old English Breviaries:—the forms *Paraclitus* and *Paraclitus*:—iotacism:—*acidia*:—*Kyrieleison* and *Christeleison*:—*Letania* and *Letany*:—English rule.—Old English accent:—diæresis:—syncopation:—the letters *l*, *n*, *r*:—the words *devil* and *evil*:—custom and etymology.—*Spirit*:—313. *Christen*.—*Worldes end*:—destruction of metre by modernizers of spelling.—321. Mistakes of our author.—323. PP.—336. D.D.—338. Certificate of the Bishops concerning Dr. Morton.—349. Cranmer's Register.—354. The guardianship of the temporalities of a See granted either before or after Consecration:—Cardinal Wolsey.—362. The Grand Abridgement:—differences between it and the *Ascuns &c.*—363. Ridley's leases.

MR. WILLIAMS'S APPENDIX AND INDEX.

ADDENDA TO THE PRECEDING NOTES.

P. 17. Paris, when made an Archbishopric.—18. Renaudot's MS.—19-171. Various translations of quotations &c. not already translated.—72. The Rev. W. Cole:—his acute interesting MS. notes to Strype's Memorials of Cranmer:—his MS. Index to d°. :—his MS. *Athenæ Cantabrigienses*.—142 and 144. Opinions of Cranmer and Barlow with respect to the Sacraments.—162. Morinus.—165. Gregory the Great.

MS. ADDITIONS ETC. OF THE AUTHOR FOR THE DEFENCE OF THE PRESENT WORK.

MS. CORRECTIONS AND A NOTE OF D° FOR THE SUPPLEMENT TO THE PRESENT WORK AND ITS DEFENCE.

On p. lxxii, immediately after the Epitome of the Additional Notes to the Introduction should be inserted:

AN EPITOME OF THE WHOLE VOLUME (PP. LXVIII—LXXXVIII).

ADDITIONAL ERRATA FOR THE ORIGINAL OF THE PRESENT WORK,
TAKEN FROM THE DEFENCE.

A MEMORANDUM WITH RESPECT TO PP. 1—16 (P. LXXXVIII).

ADDITIONAL ERRATA

IN THE FRENCH ORIGINAL OF THE PRESENT WORK,

PRESERVED BY THE AUTHOR AS ART. XXV, VOL. IV, P. CXXXIII—CXXXV OF THE DEFENCE: SEE P. LXV OF THE PRESENT EDITOR'S INTRODUCTION, AS CORRECTED ON P. XLI AT THE END OF THE FURTHER NOTES.

“ *Errors to correct in the Dissertation printed in 1723.*

“ In the Errata printed at the end of my Dissertation, I have marked most of the
“ typographical errors, which are not properly anything more than words badly written.
“ By the printer's and my own inattention, there have slipped in some of greater conse-
“ quence, and which it is desirable to notice, in order to prevent the cavils for which
“ they have already given a handle, and of which they might perhaps occasion more.

- “ Part I. P. 21, l. 27, *cing autres*] Read, *quatre autres*.—l. 28, omit *deux le 2 Mars et deux le 24 Mars*, and read *et trois le 24 Mars*.
 “ P. 27, l. 14, *il y en avoit trois Jésuites*] Read, *il y en avoit deux Jésuites*.
 “ P. 53, l. 29, *depuis près de 700 ans*] Read, *depuis pres de 400 ans*.
 “ P. 104, l. 25, *l' onction n'est et n' a été en usage que chez les Grecs*] Read, —*n'est et n' a point été en usage chez les Grecs*.
 “ P. 184, l. 13, *et selon Hcylin ces mêmes Evêques*] Read, *et une partie des Evêques et les autres Deputez qui avoient travaillé, &c. V. p. 255*. [See the Editor's note to p. 144, “ 3—5.”]
 “ P. 254, l. 8, *ou par le plus grand nombre d' entr' eux*] Read, *ou le plus grand nombre d' entr' eux*.

“ *Errors to correct in the fragments of Latin letters, which have been joined to the Proofs of the first Dissertation.*

- “ Some errors having slipped into the fragments of Latin letters which I had joined to the Proofs of my Dissertation, those who wrote them to me have wished that I should inform the public of them; persuaded (as they are) that one cannot carry too far exactness and the love of truth, when the question is of things which concern religion.
 “ P. xci, l. 16, read, *dubitandum. Fatemur &c.*
 “ P. xcii, marg. l. 2, read, *Godwin de Præsulibus*.
 “ P. xciv, l. 24, read *Rawlins*.—Ibid. l. 28, after *fuerit* add, *vigesimo primo Confirmatio facta*.
 “ P. xcvi, l. 2, read, *consecrati, atque in eisdem installati fuissent*. Ibid. l. 28. After the word *celebratæ* add [*Electo*], although I believe this word is omitted in the Register, and for this reason it is that it ought to be within brackets.
 “ P. xcix, l. 24, after *Juxon* read *LL.D.*, that is to say *Legum Doctore*.
 “ P. ci, l. 8, read *eligendi, De*.
 “ P. ciii, l. 10. *partim*] Read *statim*. Ibid. l. 23 and p. civ, l. 4 and 30, omit *Menevensis*.
 “ P. civ, l. 7, for *Diocesios Menevens*, read *Diocesanum*.—Ibid. l. 14, for *ultimus* read *penultimus*.—Ibid. marg. l. 7, read, *VIII, fol.*; and l. 14, read, *Chap. XIII, § 3*.
 “ P. cvii, l. 20, read, *Wellensem electus*.—Ibid. l. 36, read, *de immani*.—Ibid. marg. l. 1, read, *A Dialogue*.
 “ P. cix, l. 27, read, *potuit, fuisse factam*.
 “ P. cxi, l. penult. read, *Willielmo Menevensi*.
 “ P. cxv, l. 24, read *Fitz.*, that is to say *Fitzherbert*.
 “ P. cxvi, l. 33, after *creatos* add [and alter as follows]: *post finem anni 1549 nostro more fuisse sacratos*.” [The French Edition has *nostro saltem more f. s.*, omitting “*p. f. a. 1549*”.]

N.B. The following sixteen pages apply not to the present, but to Mr. Williams's, Translation: see the Title of this volume, and the Editor's Introduction, pp. iii—xiv; from which too the reader may learn also the real value both of the author's complimentary letter (p. 11—16), and of the alleged amendment of Mr. Williams's Second Edition (see his title-page and Advertisement).—For the place which these sixteen pages ought rather to have occupied see pp. xiii, xiv.

A

DEFENCE OF THE VALIDITY

OF THE

ENGLISH ORDINATIONS,

AND OF THE

SUCCESSION OF THE BISHOPS

IN THE

CHURCH OF ENGLAND:

TOGETHER WITH

PROOFS JUSTIFYING THE FACTS

ADVANCED IN THIS TREATISE.

WRITTEN IN FRENCH BY THE REV^D FATHER PETER FRANCIS LE COURAYER,
CANON REGULAR AND LIBRARIAN OF ST. GENEVIÉVE AT PARIS.

TRANSLATED INTO ENGLISH BY DANIEL WILLIAMS,
PRESBYTER OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

TO WHICH IS PREFIXED,

A LETTER FROM THE AUTHOR TO THE TRANSLATOR.

THE SECOND EDITION, CORRECTED FROM SEVERAL ERRORS, AS WELL AS SOME
OMISSIONS, WHICH CREPT INTO THE FIRST EDITION.

Etsi hominum litigant mentes, non litigant sacramenta.

Optat. Lib. 3. §. 9.

LONDON:

PRINTED BY H. P. FOR WILLIAM AND JOHN INNYS,
JOHN OSBORNE, AND CHARLES RIVINGTON.

M. DCC. XXVIII.



TO THE
TWO GREAT ARBITERS OF LEARNING,
THE
UNIVERSITIES
OF
OXFORD AND CAMBRIDGE,
THIS PERFORMANCE
IS HUMBLY INSCRIBED,
BY THEIR UNFEIGNED WELL-WISHER,
THE TRANSLATOR.

AN ADVERTISEMENT TO THE READER

UPON THIS NEW EDITION.

Soon after my arrival in England, the booksellers acquainted me that they intended to publish a new edition of this book. I had not before seen this translation as it came from the press; but when I compared it with the original, I soon observed several expressions castrated, others so mutilated as not to be agreeable to the sense of the original; and in short, some few whole paragraphs left out, exclusive of those which the learned author desired might be omitted, and which are inserted in the Appendix in their original language. Distance from the press is a general excuse upon these occasions, and often is a very just one; but whether it will in all respects hold good in this case, I shall not take upon me now to determine, though I was really then in France. It will neither be a relief to the public, nor any satisfaction to me, to examine how these things happened: I am sure they are not now in my power to remedy any other way than by the considerable restitutions and alterations made in this present edition, which is the only one I recommend to the world as the standing translation of this Treatise.

Finding myself obliged to make such considerable alterations in this review, I have at the same time corrected my own copy where I found expressions obscure, or where I thought my own style might be made more correct. This is what I think necessary to acquaint the reader with, being incapable of making him any other satisfaction for what is passed.

D. W.

London, December 18, 1726.

THE
TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE
TO THE
READER.

IT can be no surprise to the English reader, to find me concerned in the translation of a book, upon the subject of Ordination, wherein the honour and interest of our Reformation is so nearly concerned, and which may contribute considerably to undeceive those of our own country who labour under heavy prejudices against it: and perhaps more upon this very head than any other. For however we may differ in other things, yet in this facts are to be followed, and not little, low prejudices. Besides, having been myself^a formerly concerned in this controversy, I was naturally drawn on to engage in this undertaking.

I must own, I was very well pleased to find a gentleman so noted in France for his piety and learning engage himself in this debate, being in every respect qualified to give his countrymen an idea of our Reformation, so different from that carried on in France by the Hugonots; a piece of service which the French indeed very much stood in need of, having hitherto been led away by the reports of weak, injudicious, prejudiced people, who gave such accounts of us as were more agreeable to the dictates of inclination, and want of temper, than to truth and knowledge.

What the event of this may be, no man can foretel; this being in the hands of God alone to determine. Yet who knows what a better acquaintance between us and the Gallican Clergy may in time produce? And 'tis more than possible that it may, one time or another, end in that union so much, so frequently wished for by the learned author of this

^a The Succession of Protestant Bishops asserted; &c. London, printed 1721.

Treatise. I have always been of the opinion, that if our Church were more known abroad, her members would receive much better treatment from the wise and learned of all nations: and when men have once abandoned their passions, truth is not so difficult to be discovered, and consequently peace and unity restored, as some little people may imagine.

I am very sensible that we have among ourselves some, even of the Clergy, that are sufficiently swayed by prejudice and passion: we have our implicit believers of Pope Joan, as well as they have their advocates for the Nag's-head story. Yet it is to be hoped we are not, on either side, to be swayed by men that are got into this low way of thinking; for if this be the common case of the world, I am sure it is but in an indifferent situation.

The reception which this Treatise has had from the learned men of France, is no small proof of what I now suggest; I mean, that amicable measures, and wise regulations and expedients, are at no infinite distance. There are two writers who have already done it public justice; the author of the *Nouvelles Littéraires*, and the compiler of the famous *Journal des Sçavans*. The latter is known to be M. l'Abbé des Fontaines, of whom nothing more need to be said in his praise, than that he has been thought worthy of the post he now bears, of Inspector of Divinity Books in the King's Library, by the famous Abbé Bignon, the great ornament of France.

We are indeed told that we may expect some answers to this book, particularly from a man of known learning, Father le Quien, a Jacobin Friar; but I am at a loss to guess how he will be able to get over the historical facts herein alleged, and continue just to his own character. It is however to be hoped, that he will take his informations from such as are qualified to acquaint him with the nature of our Ecclesiastical and Civil constitution, as well as with the history of that particular period of time so much concerned in this debate: for as he is a foreigner, though in other respects never so learned, and but little acquainted with our language, which is an inconveniency that the learned author of this Treatise does not in the same degree labour under, he may for this reason be led into a multitude of mistakes. If I am rightly informed,

he is but meanly supported with coadjutors as to our English affairs; however it is his business to see to this, since it is his own reputation, and not our cause, that is concerned in it.

That side of the question which this learned gentleman is, it seems, inclined to engage in, has one advantage in his hands which I think it never had before; and that is, to be treated of professedly, by a man of learning and character. Hitherto, for the most part, its advocates have been people concerned in low life, and unacquainted with the nature of the active part of Ecclesiastical and Civil affairs, and consequently unable to judge even of the force of an argument depending upon historical facts of this kind. And indeed, upon a strict enquiry, it will be found that the whole credit of this controversy has depended upon the reputation of a few weak, angry writers; who, in opposition to the evident designs of nature, as well as education, have intruded themselves upon the world as great and reputable authors.

I know it is a mean art to despise an adversary, and it is very often a great weakness; but let any learned, judicious Roman Catholic review the controversy of his own side, and I am apt to think he will easily acknowledge the justice of my observation; and that the adversaries of our Ordinations, for the most part, have not treated this subject either like scholars, divines, or gentlemen.

The reader may expect to find in this Treatise several exceptionable passages; and particularly the charge of schism imputed to the Church of England. But it is to be considered, that our author is a professed Roman Catholic, and could do no otherwise, without involving his own Church in general, and himself in particular, in that guilt. Allowances of this kind are always to be made; for his private opinion is one thing, and the reality of a fact is another; nor is schism here the question professedly debated of. What the reader is here to expect, is a just and rational vindication of our Church from the ridiculous story of a ludicrous consecration of our Bishops, in Queen Elizabeth's time, at the Nag's-head in Cheapside: a calumny, first invented to support a weak cause, and continued by persons as weak and injudicious as the first inventors of it. The succession of our Bishops in general is demonstrated, and the validity of our Ordinal is

also vindicated, with a great deal of learning as well as judgment: the powers of a national Church are asserted; and it is fully proved, that in the alterations made by our Church, she did not act in the business of Ordinations inconsistently with those powers. How far this may extend to other instances, is left to the reader's judgment to determine. The author has tied up my hands from writing any thing against the Roman Church in this Preface; so that I shall drop all debates of this nature at present, and leave every body to determine for themselves; nor am I inclined now to enter into a discussion of particular points, not only because it is the author's request, but also because it does not properly fall in with the design and the subject of this Treatise.

There is one thing which I shall beg leave to mention, and which I hope neither the author, nor any of his Communion, will think shocking to their Church; since it is only the supplying an historical fact which I think has been omitted. The author is pleased to raise an objection or two, in his sixteenth chapter, concerning the manner of our Bishops' coming to their Sees in Queen Elizabeth's reign; which he owns was upon the foot of an intrusion, and therefore that they were irregular Bishops, though not invalidly consecrated.

Thus he leaves the state of our affairs at that time, upon the foot of a schismatical Church, and schismatical Bishops, without a right to exercise the powers of a national Church. But I must beg leave to observe, that this is not exactly the state of our case: for before this, in King Edward's reign, the majority of our Bishops came into a national Reformation, being headed by their Metropolitan; and consequently we were not at that time upon the foot of intruders: and the manner how we afterwards came to be put, seemingly, upon that foot, when our Bishops were forcibly kept out of Parliament and Convocation, is too notorious to all the world. Our Bishops were illegally excluded, banished, and put to death, in the reign of Queen Mary; and those men whom he thinks unjustly deposed by Queen Elizabeth, were arbitrarily, and in defiance both of our Civil and Ecclesiastical laws, put into their places: so that the Marian Bishops are with more justice to be reputed intruders; and Queen Elizabeth only performed an act of justice, as Solomon did in the case of

Zadok and Abiathar, in restoring the regular remains of the banished Bishops to their former condition, and in deposing those who had assisted, and conspired in a schismatical manner, by making new consecrations, their Metropolitan being then living and uncondemned by any Ecclesiastical sentence; and also in putting him and several of his College of Bishops to death. This I take to be the true state of the case, which will appear evident to every one that examines into the history of those times.

But not to leave this matter liable to the least dispute, I shall presume to make one other observation, before I quit this head, which is this; that supposing it granted, which we are under no manner of necessity to do, that our first Bishops did not so legally get into the possession of their Bishoprics as I maintain they did, and that Queen Mary's Bishops were unjustly deposed; yet since they took no care to keep up their succession, but suffered it to drop, the Bishops put in by Queen Elizabeth became afterwards, upon the death of the others, to be legally possessed of their Bishoprics, because there were none that either did or could put in a claim of right in opposition to theirs; and therefore, in this sense at least, our Bishops are no intruders, and consequently no illegality on our part can arise from this particular. Nay, on the contrary, those of our country who adhered to a foreign Communion, upon their suffering their succession of Bishops to fall, ceased to be upon the foot even of a national Church: for a national Church without Bishops is, I think, somewhat new, even in the opinion of the learned men in communion with the Church of Rome.

The reader will find this Treatise written with a great deal of judgment, candour, and learning. If I have done the author justice in delivering his sentiments and reasonings, though in a style far inferior to his own, in my translation, it is the utmost of my ambition. The author is pleased to pass some compliments upon me in the following Letter upon this head, which I cannot with any justice take to myself as a matter of right, and which I should have omitted, could I have done it without breaking in upon the rest of the contents: and therefore the reader is to take what he finds of this kind, as the custom and way of speaking and writing in this complaisant country.

The author has thought fit to make some alterations in his copy, as the reader upon examination may find; but I have ordered, for the satisfaction of the curious, that the passages left out in the body of the translation should be inserted at the end of the Appendix. I did not think it equally necessary to insert the original of the additions there likewise, because my translation is sufficient for the English reader, where he will find them in their proper places in the body of the work. The author has also thought fit to alter the title page; for in the French edition he calls this book, "A Dissertation upon the Validity, &c."; but in this translation he would have it called "A Defence, &c." as being more agreeable to the design of this Treatise.

I have only one thing more to detain the reader with, before he enters upon the perusal of this work; which is, that the author's book being drawn up more for the use of the learned than the vulgar, he has not translated his Latin quotations, but inserted them entire into the body of the work. I have in some measure altered this disposition; for where I thought a passage necessary to be translated, I have done it, and inserted the original at the bottom of the page; where I have not, the unlearned reader may take it for granted, that the meaning of such a passage is contained in the words going before or following after, or that it is a matter of mere authority, and a bare testimony of a fact alleged.

Paris, Good-Friday, 1724.

LETTRE DE L'AUTEUR

AU

TRADUCTEUR.

MONSIEUR,

Si je connois trop peu les finesses de la langue Angloise pour juger de l'élégance de votre traduction, j'en sçais du moins assez pour garantir sa fidélité. Je la trouve très nette et très exacte, et elle répond fidèlement à l'original. C'est un témoignage que la justice m'oblige de vous rendre devant le public; et je le fais avec d'autant plus de plaisir, que je ne doute point que l'habileté du traducteur ne serve à relever chez les Anglois un ouvrage, qui n'aura peut être d'autre mérite pour eux que celui d'avoir été formé dans le sein de l'Eglise Catholique. En effet, il leur doit paroître assez nouveau de trouver un défenseur de leurs Ordinations parmi les Catholiques, où ils n'ont presque trouvé jusqu'ici que des adversaires. C'est ainsi qu'autrefois, à l'honneur de l'Eglise Romaine, et malgré les clameurs des ministres, le fameux Blondel s'éleva du sein des Eglises Protestantes pour anéantir la fable ridicule de la Papesse Jeanne, jusques-là si chère aux Réformés. Fable pour fable, celle de l'Ordination de Cheapside vaut bien celle de la Papesse Jeanne; et quelques uns de nos Scholastiques, et la plupart de nos Théologiens ou des Prêtres Catholiques du pays, ne sont guères moins attachés à l'une, que l'étoit à l'autre le vulgaire parmi les Protestans. Mais à la longue la vérité se fait jour à travers les préjugés les plus anciens et les plus répandus; et quand des deux côtés l'entêtement et la prévention se soutiendroient encore dans quelques particuliers contre l'évidence des faits et la solidité des preuves, la vérité n'en demeureroit pas moins triomphante au jugement des personnes éclairées et non prévenues.

C'est uniquement pour l'éclaircir que j'ai entrepris ce Traité; et quoi qu'attaché par examen et par inclination à l'unité Catholique, je n'ai pas cru devoir épouser les préjugés de nos Théologiens, et nier des choses vraies parce qu'elles sont favorables à une Eglise qui s'est séparée de nous. C'est cet attachement même à l'unité Catholique qui m'oblige de me rendre à la vérité, puisque plus nous aimons l'Eglise, plus nous devons travailler à procurer la paix et la réunion de ceux que la connoissance de nos abus et l'imputation odieuse d'un excès d'intolérance et de prévention contre eux ont séparés de nous. En effet, persuadé qu'on doit être encore plus disposé à reconnoître le bien que le mal dans ceux qui nous sont opposés, et ayant d'ailleurs toujours trouvé dans la plupart des membres de l'Eglise Anglicane, de grandes lumières, une connoissance fort étendue de l'antiquité Ecclésiastique, et beaucoup d'éloignement du renversement presque total de la discipline, introduit dans les Eglises Presbytériennes, je me fais un devoir de leur rendre la justice qu'ils méritent, et d'ouvrir à la paix un chemin que nos neveux suivront peut-être avec plus de succès. Si l'on me fait un crime de cette tentative, je ne chercherai pas à m'en justifier; et content d'avoir suivi en cela l'esprit et les maximes de l'Evangile, j'attribuerai tout ce qu'on pourra m'imputer d'odieux à un zèle plus impétueux qu'éclairé, et qui est plutôt excité par une prévention aveugle que par la science et la charité.

Au reste, Monsieur, si mon ouvrage est goûté en Angleterre, je ne doute pas que je n'en sois en partie redevable à la bonté de votre traduction. En me faisant parler votre langue, vous me procurez l'approbation d'une nation éclairée et sçavante, et vous me naturalisez, pour ainsi dire, avec un peuple estimé par tout ce qu'il y a de sçavans en Europe. C'est une obligation que j'aurai peine à reconnoître, et que je ne puis acquitter que par le désir de voir finir le schisme et la division. Je souhaite que les semences de paix et de réunion que j'ai répandues dans ce Traité puissent fructifier, dans le temps, à l'avantage de votre Eglise, et à la joie de la nôtre. Le retour de l'Eglise Anglicane à l'unité Catholique entraîneroit bientôt celui de toutes les Eglises Protestantes, qui paroissent sentir, mieux que jamais, le défaut de leur gouvernement, et les excès de leurs premiers Réformateurs. C'est le plus ardent et le

plus sincère de mes vœux, et je ne crois pas pouvoir mieux vous marquer l'estime singulière que j'ai pour votre nation et pour vous en particulier. Je suis avec toute la reconnoissance et la considération possible,

MONSIEUR,

Votre très-humble et très-obéissant Serviteur,

P. F. LE COURAYER.

A Paris, ce 14 Mars 1724.

THE
AUTHOR'S LETTER
TO THE
TRANSLATOR.

SIR,

IF I am too little acquainted with the niceties of the English language to judge of the elegance of your translation, I know enough at least to warrant its fidelity. I find it very clear and very exact, and it faithfully answers to the original. This is a testimony which justice obliges me to give you before the public; and I do it with so much the more pleasure, because I doubt not that the skill of the translator may contribute to raise among the English the reputation of a work, which perhaps will have no other merit with them, but that of having been formed in the bosom of the Catholic Church. Indeed it must appear somewhat new to them to find a defender of their Ordinations among the Catholics, where hitherto they have found hardly any thing but adversaries. It was thus that in time past, to the honour of the Church of Rome, and in spite of the clamours of the Ministers, the famous Blondel rose up from the bosom of the Protestant Churches, to annihilate the ridiculous fable of Pope Joan, to that time so dear to the Reformed. Fable for fable, that of the Ordination of Cheapside is as much to be regarded as that of Pope Joan; and some of our Schoolmen, and the greater part of our Divines and Catholic Priests of the country, are scarcely less attached to the one, than the rabble among the Protestants were to the other. But in time the truth makes its way through prejudices the most ancient and the most universal; and though on both sides obstinacy and prepossession should still maintain their ground in some individuals against the evidence of facts and the solidity of proofs, yet would the truth

remain none the less triumphant in the judgment of enlightened and unprejudiced persons.

It is only to clear up the truth that I have undertaken this Treatise ; and though attached by judgment and inclination to Catholic unity, I did not think myself obliged to espouse the prejudices of our Divines, and to deny things that are true because they are favourable to a Church that has separated herself from us. It is even this attachment to Catholic unity that obliges me to yield to the truth, since the more we love the Church, the more we ought to labour to procure the peace and the reunion of those whom the knowledge of our abuses, and the odious imputation of excessive intolerance and prejudice against them, have separated from us. In fact, being persuaded that we ought to be still more disposed to acknowledge the good than the evil in those that are opposed to us, and moreover having always found in the greater part of the members of the Church of England great understanding, a very extensive knowledge of Ecclesiastical antiquity, and a great aversion to that almost total overthrow of discipline introduced into the Presbyterian Churches, I reckon it my duty to do them the justice they deserve, and to open a way to peace which our posterity will perhaps follow with more success. If this attempt be imputed to me as a crime, I shall not endeavour to justify myself from it; and satisfied with having followed in this matter the spirit and the maxims of the Gospel, I shall attribute all odious imputations which may be laid to my charge to a zeal more violent than enlightened, and which is raised rather by a blind prejudice than by knowledge and charity.

In fine, Sir, if my work be relished in England, I doubt not that I shall be in part indebted for it to the goodness of your translation. In making me speak your language, you procure me the approbation of an enlightened and learned nation, and you naturalize me, so to say, among a people esteemed by all the learned in Europe. This is an obligation I shall hardly be able sufficiently to acknowledge, and which I cannot otherwise repay than by the desire of seeing an end put to the schism and division. I wish the seeds of peace and reunion which I have scattered in this Treatise, may in time bear fruit, to the advantage of your Church, and the joy of ours.

The return of the Church of England to Catholic unity would quickly draw after it that of all the Protestant Churches, which seem to be more sensible than ever of the defect of their government, and the excesses of their first Reformers. This is my most sincere and ardent wish, and I think I cannot better shew you the singular esteem I have for your nation and for you in particular. I am with all possible gratitude and respect,

SIR,

Your very obedient humble Servant,

P. F. LE COURAYER.

Paris, March 14, 1724.

THE
AUTHOR'S PREFACE.

How important soever the subject on which I propose to throw light in this Treatise, I do not find that our French writers have hitherto applied themselves to examine it. Whether it be that the question has not appeared to them of a nature to excite their curiosity, or that they have wanted the records necessary for informing themselves exactly in the truth of the facts, or that, being already otherwise determined by the condemnation pronounced in the reign of Queen Mary against the Bishops ordained according to the Ritual of Edward the Sixth, that predetermination has stood them in the stead of certain truth,—be this as it may, they have dispensed with enquiry, and contented themselves in this, as in many other matters, to think as others thought before them, without examining whether they were in the right or no.

The English Protestants, more concerned to defend the validity of the Ordinations of their Bishops, have also applied themselves with more diligence to enquire after what might serve to establish them. The first who did this with success was Francis Mason, Archdeacon of Norfolk, who, in his Treatise entitled “A Defence of the Church of England,” dedicated to Henri de Gondi Bishop of Paris, has collected together, with great variety as well as judgment, all the stronger and more convincing arguments on this subject. This Treatise, first composed in English, and afterwards augmented by the author, and translated into Latin by one of his friends, was attacked by an English Doctor of the Sorbonne, Champney by name; but with so unequal a force that the advantage was altogether on the side of the defender of the Church of England. The Latin Edition, which was not published till after Mason's death, contained an answer to

the Doctor ; and I do not know that this was ever replied to, whether because of Champney's incapacity to do it, or for some other reason with which we are unacquainted.

As afterwards there arose, from time to time, other writers who continued to attack the validity of the Ordinations solemnized since the changes made under King Edward, so the Church of England has not wanted defenders. Amongst the rest, Bramhall Archbishop of Armagh, Burnet Bishop of Salisbury, and many others since, have signalized themselves in this dispute ; and have also, by new examinations, put the matter in a better light. However, as most of the English books are but little known in France, and moreover, as we have but little concerned ourselves to clear up this difficulty, I do not find that we have changed our prejudices, or that we think upon this subject otherwise than we did before.

Perhaps I should not have engaged myself to examine this question more deeply, had I not been determined to it by the publication of a Memoire which appeared before the public some time since. This Memoire was inserted in the new edition of a work of Monsieur L'Abbé Gould, entitled "The True Faith of the Catholic Church, &c." The Doctor, who has given us an extract from it in the *Journal des Sçavans* of the 27th of January 1721, tells us, That the author is a man remarkable for his writings and his profound acquaintance with the Oriental languages ; and by this description it was easy to recognize Monsieur L'Abbé Renaudot, who carries with him his own recommendation, and whose mere name is an eulogy.

This name promised something exact and superior. I was in hopes to find, in my reading him, a solution of my doubts, and I expected at least some new light in a matter whereof the author was in a condition, and had a capacity to instruct. I was deceived in my expectations. And how, in fact, could I yield to arguments which have so little convinced Monsieur L'Abbé Renaudot himself, that he concludes his Memoire with acknowledging, that if he has not proofs sufficient to convince himself absolutely of the nullity of the English Ordinations, they are at least strong enough to give him a just cause to doubt of their validity.

All the benefit then which I received by reading his book was, that it revived in me a desire to re-examine a question which I had formerly studied; and this desire produced a Memoire which I communicated to some of my friends, who were so kind as to do me the favour to examine it, and who had the goodness to approve of it.

My design had been at first to proceed no farther than that Memoire; but my friends thought otherwise, because they did not find it so full as the importance of the subject deserved. I was forced therefore to new mould what I had written, that I might give a just compass both to the proofs and to the difficulties; and this was the origin of the Treatise which I now commit to the judgment of the public, and what at the same time has retarded its publication. This delay however has not been altogether useless. While I was taking the time necessary to search for all the materials of which I could make use, an English author, more diligent than myself, answered his Memoire of Monsieur Renaudot's, in a pamphlet entitled, *De Vera et non Interrupta Episcoporum ad nos usque Anglorum Successione, ad Amicum Epistola*. This pamphlet, though very short, contains notwithstanding the strongest proofs of the validity of the English Ordinations, and some remarks altogether new upon certain facts. Of these I have made a good use in this Treatise; and the author writes with so much assurance of what he advances, that I have not scrupled to make him a voucher for these facts.

If the works of the English in favour of their Ministry were better known, I should not have troubled the public with a book of which it would have had but little need; but I hope shall be indulged in some degree in favour of a question so important, and so little examined among us, as that I propose to treat of. The thing in question is no less than to know whether the Church of England, formerly so illustrious, and even now so respectable for the enlightenment of her Prelates, and the erudition of her Clergy, is without a Succession, without a Hierarchy, and without a Ministry. Many of our Divines maintain this, and the English deny it.

It is true that though these latter should be in the right, yet their separation would not thereby become either more justifiable, or fitter to inspire them with confidence: nothing

can excuse schism. There is never, according to St. Augustine, just reason to break unity. Even our abuses and our vices, though they may palliate their schism in the eyes of the simple, cannot justify it, when the matter is weighed by the doctrines and principles of the ancient Church; and do what they will to weaken its authority, it is a weight that bears them down, and gives us an advantage which they cannot pretend to deny.

But though in proving their Succession, they recover not all the advantages they have lost in separating themselves from the Church, it is nevertheless one of which we ought carefully to make the best use for them, and which it is important not to lose. How much soever separated we may be from each other, our reunion is nothing impossible. Of all the Churches which have broken the unity, the Church of England has kept the nearest to us. She has even retained the greater part of our customs and ceremonies; and if some Divines laboured with the same industry to reunite men's minds, and to banish all the seeds of division, as they seem bent on perpetuating it, and heightening disputes, we might perhaps in our own days see the Schism end, and peace, and the blessings of truth and charity, return.

This is the motive I proposed to myself in examining this important question. As, however, the part I have taken on this subject has not hitherto been much followed by our authors, people will perhaps be surprised that I should have abandoned them, and undertaken the defence of the Church of England against them. But the truth ought to be dearer to us than the nearest ties, and we have no other interest in all our enquiries, than to seek and embrace it. After all, the part I have thought myself obliged to take must not be supposed so extraordinary that I might not calm the scruples of some Divines by very respectable authorities. The learned Bishop of Meaux, Jacques Benigne Bossuet, whose zeal and erudition have been so long the admiration of all France, was much inclined to this side; and in a letter written to D. Jean Mabillon, dated the 12th of August 1685, (the original whereof was communicated to me by D. Vincent Thuillier, a learned Benedictine of my acquaintance,) he delivers his thoughts concerning it clearly enough. "As to

the affair of England," says he, "besides the difficulty with respect to the first Bishops, the authors of the Schism, there is also another great one at the time of Cromwell; when it is contended that the succession of the Ordination was interrupted. The English maintain the contrary; and as to the succession at the beginning of the Schism, they maintain that there is no difficulty; and in this they seem to be in the right."

This authority alone deserves a particular attention, and gives us to understand that from that time views were entertained concerning the reunion of the two Churches; and if the majority of our Divines have not entered into these views, but condemned with little reflection the validity of the English Ordinations, it was because they scarcely ever attempted seriously to examine the question, but were determined rather by prejudice and example, than by any true knowledge of the matter. The mere fear of seeming to favour schism or heresy is enough of itself, at certain times, to make men avoid the examination of facts from which instruction might be drawn; and in a situation so favourable to prejudices and error, it is no wonder that the false opinions are perpetuated, and by a sort of tradition acquire an air of authority which belongs only to the truth.

It is only in order to find out the truth, and contribute by this means to bring the Schism the more speedily to an end, that I have engaged in this enquiry. Re-ordinations have always had something odious in the Church; and in proportion as men have applied themselves to reason about Divinity by principles, the difficulties about the Ordinations of heretics and schismatics have been abated. At last this was laid down as an undoubted maxim, That all those Ordinations, in which nothing essential was omitted, should be accounted valid, by reason of the sacramental stamp, which is indelible.

It is then to this point that we must refer all we have to examine in this Treatise. The importance of the subject obliges me to do it with all the exactness and impartiality that I possibly can. It is true that the advantages which would arise from the reunion of the Church of England with us, ought naturally to incline us to favour whatever tends to prove the validity of their Ministry. But as in the examination of facts we ought to regard only what establishes or

destroys their certainty, we must renounce the path of prejudice and interest, in order to be determined only by the evidence and the solidity of the proofs.

In order to treat this subject with some method, I shall first set forth the changes that have happened in the Church of England with regard to the succession of their Bishops, and their Ordination. I shall shew afterwards that notwithstanding the changes introduced by Edward the Sixth in the Ordinal, there was nothing essential omitted in the Consecration of Parker, who is the origin and source of the English Ministry, such as it subsists at this day. In the chapters that follow, I shall prove the truth of Barlow's Consecration, upon which that of Parker depends; and I shall endeavour to refute all the arguments which are brought against it. In fine, in discussing some general difficulties which are made use of to attack the validity of the new Ordinations, I shall endeavour to lay down principles and maxims which may serve not only to establish the goodness of the English Ordinations, but also to the decision of other facts that might happen of the same kind. I shall moreover examine with some care, what authority a national Church may challenge in what concerns the administration of the Sacraments: and I hope to make it evident, that the Church of England has not exceeded her powers in those alterations she thought it right to make in her Rites. By the examination of all these facts, and of these principles, it will be easy to decide what ought to be thought of the practice of many Bishops, who re-ordain the English; and I think men will be easily convinced by the proofs we have produced, that this custom is contrary to all the received maxims of the Church in the matter of Re-ordinations, and that it is founded only upon chimerical facts, upon opinions that are abandoned, and upon doubts that have no foundation.

For the rest, I have made it my particular care through this whole Dissertation, to advance nothing without proof. The documents I have caused to be printed at the end of this Treatise, are my vouchers for the truth of the facts. Where printed books are deficient, I have had recourse to the Archives, if not by myself, at least by persons of distinction, who have the privilege of consulting every where, and who

have had the kindness to forward my designs. The extracts of some letters with which they have honoured me, and which I have inserted among my Proofs, may take the place of original acts, the citations being copied out of the Registers. If I have suppressed the authors' names, it has been rather out of deference to their own modesty, than from any wish to make their researches my own. Besides, my silence is altogether a loss to me, since their correspondence would do me honour, and I should find in the praise they deserve, and which they oblige me to suppress, a return flattering to my self-love. The truth is, I have put all in requisition, and spared neither pains nor friends, in order to inform myself, or be undeceived.

I dare flatter myself further, that I have brought neither prejudice nor interest to the examination of this question. I may be deceived as well as another, and perhaps more easily than another man; but people may depend upon a docile disposition in me, if any one convinces me that I have been mistaken; and I shall esteem it as great an honour to retract my error, as to have discovered the truth. Far from fearing to be undeceived, I invite all those to write that are well versed in this subject; and so long as charity and decorum are observed, the controversy will tend only to make the truth triumphant. But what those of different sentiments must have some regard to, is not to pretend to confute me by odious consequences or endless objections. They must confine themselves, as I have done, to matters of fact, and not call in Theology to their aid, except so far as some principles are necessary to deduce their application. Any other method would be foreign to the purpose; and I declare beforehand, that I do not intend to give weight to odious suspicions, by removing them, nor to follow endless digressions, which would make one lose sight of the subject of the debate.

I have not given myself up to conjectures, nor to sallies of imagination; facts only require fidelity, and this I have scrupulously observed. I have advanced nothing but upon the authority of contemporary witnesses, or of authors who have examined the Registers themselves. One may sufficiently rely on the fidelity of the English, who publish with

almost equal readiness, what is against them, and what is in their favour.

It is not necessary that I should explain to the public the reasons that have retarded the publication of this work, which was finished long ago. This is a secret which concerns only the author: what is most material, is that it prove useful, however late the time of its appearing. The impatience caused by the delay, and the novelty of the subject, would assure me all the success imaginable, if I could but flatter myself that I have not weakened the truth by my defects. It is the public that must determine this, and their judgment I am far from declining; for which way soever it be, either their approbation will confirm me in the truth, if I have found it, or their censure will bring me back to it, if I have deviated from it.

But in order that nobody may be obliged to search elsewhere for the Memoire to which it is the purpose of this Treatise to reply, and that there may be no room left to imagine it has been misrepresented in order to its being the more easily refuted, I have thought it right both for the reader's convenience, and for my own justification, to have it printed at the head of this Dissertation, as it is published in Monsieur L'Abbé Gould's work. That pious and zealous author will not accuse me of having concealed the difficulties put forth in the Memoire. All he can complain of is, that I have made Monsieur L'Abbé Renaudot its author. But even in this particular, he ought rather to complain of the authors of the Journal des Sçavans, since it was they that acquainted the public with this circumstance, and I have a right to presume that they would not have done it without some reason or knowledge of the matter.

MEMOIRE

OF

MONSIEUR L'ABBÉ RENAUDOT

UPON THE VALIDITY OF THE ENGLISH ORDINATIONS,

EXTRACTED FROM MONSIEUR L'ABBÉ GOULD'S BOOK ENTITLED, THE TRUE FAITH OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH, &c. PRINTED AT PARIS BY J. B. COIGNARD. EDITION OF 1720.

THAT which ought to be yet still more convincing, [that Page 183. the surest way to salvation is to be in Communion with the Roman Church,] is that the lawful Ordination communicated by Jesus Christ to His Apostles and their successors, is no where to be met with but in that Church, as the Protestants themselves have acknowledged; since they have occasionally been seen endeavouring to steal Ordination from us. The Bohemian brothers formerly attempted it; and is it not known that Queen Elizabeth of England, not being able to find any Catholic Bishop who was inclined to consecrate Parker, whom she had made Archbishop of Canterbury, used all manner of means towards my Lord Richard Creagh Archbishop of Armagh, and Primate of Ireland, then a prisoner in the Tower of London, to oblige him to lay hands upon him^a? That holy Prelate however chose rather to languish under the chains of his prison, than to purchase his liberty by committing so horrid a sacrilege.

Matthew Parker had been nominated to the Archbishopric of Canterbury in 1559, by Queen Elizabeth, who having wished to have him consecrated by a Catholic Bishop, wished also that the new Bishops should be ordained after the same

[^a On this story see the Editor's notes. Ed.]

manner, in order that the validity of their Ordination might not afterwards be called in question. To this end there was issued a Commission directed to Gilbert Bishop of Bath, Cuthbert Bishop of Durham, David Bishop of Peterborough, Anthony Bishop of Landaff, and Scory and Barlow, who are styled Bishops, but without any mention of their Sees; which makes it credible that they were not consecrated. The three first refused to consecrate Parker: whereupon Elizabeth had despatched a second Commission directed to Barlow, to Anthony of Landaff, to Scory, to Coverdale, to two suffragans, and to Bale Bishop of Ossory in Ireland. The Bishop of Landaff refused to act, although he had taken the Oath of Supremacy; and at last, after several difficulties, it was Barlow, assisted by Scory, Coverdale, and Hodgskins, that consecrated Parker on the 6th^b of December 1559, and Parker afterwards ordained all the rest from whom the Church of England derives her Ordination.

The Consecration of Parker was immediately disputed against by the Catholics, who demonstrated the nullity of it by substantial arguments; and some persons, as ocular witnesses, asserted that it was performed clandestinely in a tavern. The Protestants defended themselves but very insufficiently from this accusation, which was objected to them at the time, or some few years afterwards, by several Catholics; and some of them had nothing else to say for themselves, but that Ordination, as practised up to that time, was not necessary. In short, it was not till the year 1616^c that Mason, having undertaken to draw up an apology for the English Ordinations, quoted a register at Lambeth, which contained an account of Parker's Ordination. Burnet and Collier, who have written since, have published it as an authentic record, to refute the story of the tavern, and at the same time to prove that the Ordination of Parker was regularly performed; although this very record, such as they published it more than fifty years after the time, proves quite the contrary.

^b The author of the Memoire is mistaken: Parker was not consecrated until the 17th of December.

^c Another mistake: Mason's book was first published in 1613, and there was no edition published in 1616. This

shews how well qualified this writer was to engage in this subject, when it appears he had not so much as consulted the books that treat of it, but writ by hearsay only. [N.B. This note is not in the French edition. Ed.]

For, first, it proves that Barlow was the consecrating Bishop; and it cannot be proved that he was consecrated himself. It is true he had been nominated to several Bishoprics, but Mason owns that he could not find the record of his Ordination in Cranmer's register, though all the rest were exactly set down there, and even their translations. Godwin, a very faulty author, says positively, but without proof, that Barlow was consecrated in 1535; but this assertion is destroyed by indisputable proofs; for Rymer has lately published, among his records taken out of the English Archives, a Commission of Queen Elizabeth's directed to Parker to consecrate Barlow as Bishop of Chichester, and another to consecrate Scory, who was also one of the assisting Bishops. The Bishop of Landaff refused to consecrate Parker, because Bonner Catholic Bishop of London, then a prisoner and deposed, signified to him that he would excommunicate him if he presumed to perform that office. Bonner would have sent the same message to Barlow, if he had thought him a Bishop.

This same Bonner was molested in 1564 by Horn Bishop of Winchester, who had been ordained by Parker, because he had refused, even to that time, to take the Oath of Supremacy. He answered no otherwise than that it was Horn's business, as well as that of the rest, to prove that they were Bishops. The Judges would determine nothing, and the affair was laid before Parliament, who declared that those persons ordained according to the Pontifical of Edward the Sixth were true Bishops; but the accusation against Bonner was dropped.

This same Lambeth Register supplies us with another proof, which is of no less force against the validity of Parker's Ordination; which is, that he was ordained according to the Pontifical of Edward the Sixth, and every one must agree that this form is entirely defective; for it is conceived in these words: "*Take the Holy Ghost, and remember that thou stir up the grace of God which is in thee by Imposition of Hands: For God hath not given us the spirit of fear, but of power, and love, and of soberness.*" It will never be found that any Church has ordained Bishops after this manner; since this form is as well adapted to the Ordination of Priests as to that of

Bishops; which was the reason why at the Restoration of King Charles the Second, some words were added to it, to determine its sense to the Priesthood or to the Episcopate. But, as the English Catholic Divines have very wisely observed, a form unknown to the whole Latin Church, ancient as well as modern, of which no trace is found in the Pontificals of all Christian countries, cannot be looked upon as valid.

So that if there remained but one doubt as well grounded as this, there is neither a Priest nor Bishop in England, ordained in this manner, that can be assured of his Ordination: and that so much the more because in the beginning of Henry the Eighth's Schism, though he made no alterations as to doctrine and the administration of the Sacraments, yet Cranmer and his adherents were consulted with upon several articles. The eleventh was, "Whether the Ordination of Priests and Bishops were necessary?" Cranmer and Barlow answered that it was not, and that the appointment of the Prince was sufficient. Yet while this Prince lived, there was no Consecration made but according to the Roman Pontifical; for which reason the Catholics have never made any difficulty in acknowledging those as true Priests and Bishops, who were ordained after this manner. If some have contended that the defect of power, because they received it from the King, rendered the Ordination null; yet this opinion has not been approved by the rest, since it only proves the illegality, and not the nullity of the Ordination. This was likewise the judgment of Cardinal Pole, whose capacity everybody knows. For in the reign of Queen Mary, he, together with the remaining Catholic Bishops and the most learned Divines, ordained that the Priests and Bishops who should reunite themselves to the Catholic Church, should be reinstated in their functions, provided they had been ordained according to the Roman Pontifical; and that those who had been ordained by the Ritual of Edward the Sixth should be re-ordained, in case they were found worthy of it. Conformably to this resolution, those who were condemned to death as heretics, were not degraded except of those Orders which they had received according to the Roman Pontifical; the others, being regarded as laymen, were not degraded at all.

What then can this succession be, of which the Church of England boasts so much, against which there are doubts so strong and pressing, that they cannot be answered? and that too while there is no Communion separated from that of Rome, against which the same objections can be raised? The succession of the Bishops of the Greek Church is very certain, nor can any reasonable difficulty be raised against the validity of their Ordinations. The Copts of Alexandria have their Bishops ordained by Dioscorus and his successors. The Syrian Jacobites, and the Nestorians, prove also in like manner the succession of the Episcopate among them; and as their Offices of Ordination are the same with those of the Greeks, none can dispute their authority. In fine, we meet, in the history of the Church of Alexandria, with something that resembles the English Ordinations, which makes it appear that those people, amidst all the evils they endured from the infidels, had neither forgotten nor despised the ancient doctrine and discipline of the Church. Ethiopia was without Priests, by reason of the long vacancy of the Metropolitan See. The King obliged one of those that remained, to execute the office of a Metropolitan, and to perform Ordinations; which the Patriarchs of Alexandria declared null. This King had the same authority with Henry the Eighth and Edward the Sixth, and even a greater, according to Monsieur Ludolph, who certainly is much mistaken. He had stronger reasons than these two others. Nevertheless the Church of Alexandria did not judge otherwise of these Ordinations, than the Catholics judge of that of Parker.

Such is the original of the Ordinations of all the Bishops and Priests of England. To establish its validity, which was contested, because the Acts relating to religion passed by Edward the Sixth had been repealed by Queen Mary, a new Act was passed in the eighth year of Elizabeth, by which the Act which had regulated the Form of Ordination was revived. This Act rectified all the defects that might be found in such an Ordination; and this Statute, as null as that which it rectified and confirmed, is the foundation of the whole English Ordination.

In vain have the Catholic Doctors, as well in that age as since, reproached the Church of England in their public

writings with the nullity of an Ordination so irregular; and pressed them to name the Bishop who consecrated Dr. Parker and the rest, and in what place they were consecrated. She kept a profound silence upon this subject for the space of fifty-four years.

So that the validity of the Ordination of the whole Protestant Clergy of England, as appears even by the thirty-sixth Article of their Confession, is founded only upon an Act of Parliament, and upon Queen Elizabeth's dispensation; and this being so, must it not of necessity be allowed that this Church is entirely destitute of the Succession and of lawful Ordination?

But what is very remarkable is, that the very objections which we make against these gentlemen upon the subject of the nullity of their Ordination, they themselves make to the French Calvinists; since they do not receive their Ministers among them to preach, or to perform any other Ecclesiastical functions, without ordaining them anew, as destitute of the sacramental stamp [of Orders] before. They do not observe the same conduct towards the apostate Priests and Monks of the Catholic Church; they receive them joyfully, and with open arms, without ordaining them anew, provided they shew them their Letters of Orders in due form.

A DEFENCE
OF
THE VALIDITY
OF
THE ENGLISH ORDINATIONS,
&c.

CHAP. I.

HISTORY OF THE CHANGES THAT HAVE TAKEN PLACE IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF ORDERS AMONG THE ENGLISH SINCE THE TIME OF THE REFORMATION.

It is well known upon what occasion Henry the Eighth separated himself from the Church of Rome. That Prince's divorce^a from Queen Catharine, and his criminal marriage with Ann Boleyn, is the epoch, and was the origin, of that sad event. The English themselves are ashamed of it, and have no other plea to urge, to cover a beginning so scandalous, than that saying of St. Augustine, That God can cause the greatest good to spring from the greatest evil. This is not the place to examine whether the application of this maxim is just; but what is certain is this, that the separation of that Prince drew, almost in an instant, his whole kingdom after him, and by a rebound those of Scotland and Ireland; and that the consequences were soon seen in the overthrow of all the ancient laws, and of subordination to legitimate authority.

To confine myself here to what regards the subject of the Ordinations; the innovations began in the year 1533, which was the first year of the Schism. But as Henry, though he separated himself from the Church of Rome, remained attached to her doctrine, and was a declared enemy to the new opinions, these innovations were but few, and nothing more was done in his reign than to abolish out of the Ordinal the Oath of Obedience which the Bishops made to the Pope at

^a The sentence of divorce was pronounced by Cranmer in 1533.

CHAP. I. their Ordination. With the exception of this change all the rites and ceremonies prescribed by the Roman Ritual were religiously preserved. "Henry the Eighth," says Sanders^b, "ordained that no one elected a Bishop should seek Pontifical Bulls, or the Apostolic mandate concerning Consecration, but only exhibit the King's Diploma; in pursuance of which, being ordained by three Bishops, with the consent of the Metropolitan, he was ordered by an Act of Parliament, made in imitation of the ancient Canons, to be a true Bishop; nor was any one otherwise ordained to be acknowledged as such; yet the ceremonial and solemn unction, according to Ecclesiastical usage, he chose should still be used in that Consecration." In fact, by the statute passed the twenty-fifth year of Henry the Eighth it was ordered^c, that the Archbishops or Bishops, to whom the King's patent should be addressed for the Consecration of any Bishop, should proceed to that office, and use all the benedictions and ceremonies requisite in such case. But at that time there had been nothing changed from the Roman Pontifical. Thus it scarcely appeared at all during this reign, that there had been any innovation in this Office, although one of the most solemn in the Church.

But under Edward the Sixth, things did not stop here. The Roman Pontifical was abandoned, and in its place was substituted a Form of Ordination altogether new, which was published by the authority of Parliament in 1549^d. In 1552, this Formulary was annexed to the Book of Common-Prayer, and the Parliament authorized it anew^e. This statute was repealed in the first year of the reign of Queen Mary^f, and the use of the Roman Pontifical resumed in the Ordination of Bishops; but this practice continued only during the reign of that Princess. One of the first cares of Elizabeth, as soon

^b Henricus VIII. decrevit, ne quisquam electus in Episcopum Bullas Pontificias seu mandatum Apostolicum de consecratione requireret, sed Regium tantum diploma adferret; secundum quod, a tribus Episcopis, cum consensu Metropolitanæ, ordinatus, jubebatur lege comitiorum, facta ad imitationem antiquorum canonum, esse verus Episcopus; nec alio modo ordinatum pro Episcopo agnosci oportere: ceremoniam autem et solennem unctionem more Ecclesi-

astico adhuc in consecratione illa adhiberi voluit. Sand. de Schism. Angl. lib. 3. pag. 348.

^c Statutes at Large, vol. 1. p. 425. This and the following Statutes are given among the Proofs.

^d Ibid. p. 674. and Heylin's History of the Reformation p. 82.

^e Statutes at large, vol. 1. p. 676.

^f Ibid. p. 709. and Heylin, p. 198. [vol. 2. p. 28.]

as she had ascended the throne, was to put matters upon the same footing as they were in the time of King Edward; and in order to this, in her first Parliament, held in the year 1559^g, the Book of Common-Prayer was restored with the same authority which it had under that Prince. This Statute was confirmed in the year 1566, and at the same time that they declared valid all the Ordinations performed under Elizabeth, according to the Ritual of Edward the Sixth, they there explained themselves more clearly and precisely with respect to the new Form of Ordination, which was solemnly confirmed and ratified^h.

The revolution which was brought about by the Rebellion against King Charles the First, introduced a change in the discipline of the kingdom. On the twenty-sixth of January 1643ⁱ, a Bill was passed in the House of Lords for the abolition of Episcopacy; and in 1646^j this abolition was confirmed by an Ordinance of both Houses. However this change lasted but a little while, and ended with the death of Cromwell. One of the first cares of Charles the Second was to restore the usages which existed before the troubles, and he gave a Commission to some Bishops and several Divines to review the Book of Common-Prayer, and the Form of Ordination. This Book and Form, together with the corrections and additions that were made in them, were approved by Parliament in 1662^k, and this is the last period wherein any variations happened upon this head. For since that time, this Church has always conformed to the new Ritual of Charles the Second.

How considerable soever these innovations may appear, Changes in
Scotland. they are nothing in comparison with what happened in Scotland. As the Presbyterian government got the upper hand from the first in that Church, the Reformers introduced into it, together with the doctrine of Calvin, all the maxims and discipline of Geneva. They established, in the year 1560, Elders, Ministers, and Deacons; and, according to the example of the Lutheran Churches in Germany, a species of Bishops also, whom they styled Superintendents. To the assembly held in the month of January 1561 were presented,

^g Statutes at Large, vol. 1. p. 763.

^h Ibid. p. 816.

ⁱ The Life [History of the Troubles

and Trial] of William Laud, p. 200.

^j Collier's Hist. vol. 2. p. 821, 848.

^k Statutes at Large, vol. 1. p. 1198.

CHAP.
I. Articles of Ecclesiastical Polity¹, drawn up by John Knox^m, a Presbyterian, wherein there was mention made of the Election and Ordination of Superintendents, Ministers, Deacons, and Elders, and wherein, though the imposition of hands had been preserved, yet it was not reputed as a thing necessaryⁿ; but these articles were not ratified, and it was by their private authority alone, that the new Ministers established their new discipline in Scotland.

In the year 1572^o, they wished to give some fixed form to their discipline, and extended the power of the Bishops a little further than the Presbyterians wished; and, says Calderwood^p, “This was the first sort of Bishops which was brought in to our Reformed Kirk:” but even this kind of re-establishment of Episcopacy did not continue long. For, as the same author adds, they were not endured at most above three or four years, and the Assembly itself would not give a positive approbation to the book of discipline, and abide by the judgment of the Commissioners. In a word, by the book of discipline presented to the Parliament of Scotland in 1578, we see plainly, that they preserved nothing but mere Presbyterianism, though they retained the name of Bishops^q. For it was the imposition of the hands of the Elders which they required for the Election of the Ministers^r, and they ordered that the Bishops should be subject to the Presbytery; and that they should not perform any function, but what should be given them in charge by the Church^s. This discipline was fully established at Edinburgh in 1581, and it was that year that the first Presbytery was formed there^t under the authority of the laws.

Under the shadow of this discipline, the maxim extended itself, That imposition of hands was unnecessary in the Ordination of Ministers. In fact, Robert Bruce, who was afterwards for several years a preacher at Edinburgh, having been chosen one of the Ministers of that city in 1598, and being pressed to receive imposition of hands^u, refused it, on the

¹ Calderwood's Hist. of the Church of Scotland, p. 24. Spotswood's Hist. of the Church of Scotland, p. 152.

^m [Spotswood, p. 174.]

ⁿ [Ib. p. 156. Calderwood, p. 26.]

^o Spotswood, p. 260.

^p History &c. p. 56.

^q [See Chap. 4. of the book itself in] Spotswood, p. 292. [and in Calderwood, p. 105.]

^r [Ibid. Chap. 3.]

^s Spots. p. 303. [Cald. p. 85.]

^t Calderwood, p. 116.

^u Spots. p. 451. Cald. p. 423.

ground, as he said, that the approbation of the Assembly served him instead of Ordination. He afterwards received it, being forced to it by the importunity of several persons, but declared that he did not look upon this imposition of hands as a new Ordination, but simply as a designation to a particular flock; and it appears that the Ordainers consented thereto.

A few years afterwards, James the First united in himself the Crowns of England and Scotland. This Prince, zealous for Episcopacy, was desirous to re-establish it in Scotland. But as they had no Bishops there who had power to consecrate others, he sent for three Ministers to come into England, whom he had consecrated in 1610, by the Bishops of London, Ely, Rochester, and Worcester^v; and these Bishops afterwards consecrated others according to the Ritual of Edward the Sixth. This consecration was not without some difficulty, because the Bishop of Ely wished to have these Ministers ordained Priests before they were consecrated, they not having received the Order of Priesthood from any Bishop. But Bancroft Archbishop of Canterbury having maintained^w, that the Ordination given by Presbyters ought to be esteemed valid, when there were no Bishops, or that otherwise the greater part of the reformed Churches would be found to want Ministers, and that moreover the Episcopal power might supply the other Orders, of which there were examples in antiquity, this opinion was acquiesced in, and they contented themselves with consecrating the new Bishops, without making them pass through the inferior Orders.

Things continued nearly in this state until the time of the famous Rebellion which brought King Charles the First to the block. For at that time Episcopacy was again abolished^x in the Assemblies of Glasgow and Edinburgh^y, in order to re-establish Presbyterianism upon its ruins. It continued actually suppressed, notwithstanding the opposition of the old Bishops, until the Restoration of King Charles the Second, who made it his business to restore to the Bishops their authority and their Consecration. It was for this that in 1664, he caused four

^v Spotswood, p. 514. Calderwood, p. 644.

History, vol. 2. p. 702.

^w Heylin's Hist. of the Presbyterians, p. 387. and Collier's Ecclesiastical

^x The Life [History of the Troubles and Trial] of W. Laud, p. 56.

^y In [1638 and] 1639.

CHAP.
I.

Presbyterian Ministers to come to London, who, after having acknowledged the invalidity of their former Ordination, and having been first ordained Deacons and Priests, were consecrated Bishops by the Bishop of Winchester, assisted by two others^z.

This one might have imagined would have been the last period of these changes; but the Revolution of 1688 gave birth to a new turn in the government of that Church^a. The Scottish Bishops were much attached to King James the Second. Upon the news of the expedition of the Prince of Orange against his father-in-law, these Prelates wrote to the King to assure him of their fidelity. This letter was fatal not only to the Bishops who had written it, but even to Episcopacy itself. For the Presbyterians, taking advantage of the favour which King William bore towards them, and of the hatred he conceived against the Bishops who were attached to King James, made a solemn demand in Parliament in 1689, for the
Abolished. abolition of Episcopacy^b. This demand was granted them in 1695. The Marquess of Tweedale assured both Houses on the part of King William^c, that His Majesty would take especial care of the peace of the Church, and that his intention was to maintain the Presbyterian government such as it had been established. This was the final termination of the movements which had agitated that Church ever since the commencement of the Reformation; and there is reason to believe that Episcopacy is become too odious there to be able to recover itself, if Calvinism does not give way to the old religion.

Changes
compared.

The result of the facts which we have just related is, that the changes in the Church of England must not be confounded with those in the Church of Scotland; that in the one Episcopacy has always been the prevailing government, excepting a few years wherein it appeared to be abolished, but through which nevertheless there remained Bishops enough to consecrate new ones, immediately after the Restoration of Charles the Second; but that in Scotland, on the contrary, at the beginning of the pretended Reformation, Episcopacy was

^z Collier's Ecclesiastical Hist. vol. 2. p. 887. The Life of King Charles the Second, [in vol. 3. of "A complete History of England," &c. London, 1706,] p. 253.

^a The Lives of King William and Queen Mary, [in vol. 3. &c. (as in the preceding note),] p. 520.

^b *Ib.* p. 538.

^c *Ib.* p. 701.

annihilated, and has reappeared only by intervals, and that too so weakened by the usurpations of the Presbyterian Ministers, that the Bishops preserved only the shadow of their authority and dignity. It is not then the Ordination of the Scottish Bishops that I am to consider here. The first, whom they called Superintendents, in imitation of the German Churches, were no true Bishops, as it would be easy to shew, nor can we recognise as such any but those whom King James the First and King Charles the Second brought into England in 1610 and 1664 to be there consecrated, and those whom these Bishops consecrated afterwards. But these two efforts having led to no succession, and the validity of their Ordination depending entirely upon that of the English Bishops, it is unnecessary to enter into the question of the validity or invalidity of the Scottish Ordinations; and what we have to say concerning the Ordination of the English, will be more than sufficient to determine what we ought to think of the others.

As to what regards the changes of the Church of England with respect to the Ordination of her Bishops, they reduce themselves properly to five. 1. That which was made under Henry the Eighth. 2. That under Edward the Sixth. 3. That under Elizabeth. 4. That under Cromwell. 5. And lastly, that under Charles the Second. Under Henry the Eighth, the oath which they were accustomed to take to the Pope was abolished out of the form of Ordination, but the rest of the ceremonial subsisted as it did before. Under Edward the Sixth, there was nothing preserved as the substance of Ordination except the imposition of hands; and as to the prayers and forms, they were almost all changed. Under Elizabeth the Ritual of Edward was restored, but the difficulty is to know whether it was done by a sufficient authority. Under Cromwell Episcopacy was abolished in 1646, and along with it the Formulary of Ordinations. Lastly, under Charles the Second, when Episcopacy was re-established, the old Formulary of Edward the Sixth was restored, but revised, and such as it is still used in the Church of England, which has solemnly received and approved it.

Five
changes in
England.

The change that happened in the time of Cromwell Cromwell. gives us no trouble. As there were no Ordinations performed during the time of his government, there is nothing to discuss on this head. The Bishops who survived that

CHAP. I. Usurper ordained others in the room of those that were dead; and there was no other misfortune attending this interruption, but the long vacancy of several Sees.

Henry the Eighth. There is no greater trouble with respect to what happened in the time of Henry the Eighth. All Catholics agree that the bare omission of the oath made to the Pope, is not sufficient to render an Ordination invalid; and besides, several of the Bishops ordained by Cranmer without having taken that oath having been allowed as true Bishops, and not re-ordained at the time of the union under Mary, the thing appears indisputable.

Remaining question. It remains that we consider whether the Ordinations performed according to the new Ritual of Edward the Sixth, Elizabeth, and Charles the Second, may and ought to be received as valid. We make here but one question of these three different periods; for it will be seen as we go on, that we ought to give but one and the same decision to them all, the changes made under Charles the Second having been of too little importance to produce any difference in the judgment we ought to pass on the subject. It is true, that some people would have the addition pass for essential which was made in the time of Charles the Second to the form, *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum*^d; but I do not see how it can be proved, and the mere comparison of the Roman Pontifical is sufficient to prove the contrary.

Parker. But before examining what proves the validity or invalidity of the English Ordinations, it is convenient to relate the history of that of Parker, in which are found more difficulties than in any other. As this Prelate is the stem and source of the new Ministry, if his Ordination is invalid, the others fall of themselves; and on the contrary, the validity of it naturally establishes the truth of the Hierarchy in that Church, although schism and error have obscured its Succession.

It is then on this particular fact that we must fasten, as that which alone can serve to determine clearly this question. And as Monsieur L'Abbé Renaudot, in his Memoire, has used all his efforts to destroy the validity of this Ordination, it is necessary to acquaint the reader at once with the state of the case, by setting forth clearly and succinctly in what manner the affair was transacted.

^d [Receive the Holy Ghost.]

CHAP. II.

HISTORY OF PARKER'S ORDINATION BY BARLOW. AUTHENTICITY OF THE RECORD WHEREIN IT IS RELATED, AND FALSEHOOD OF THE STORIES PUBLISHED ON THE SUBJECT.

CARDINAL POLE surviving Queen Mary but a few hours, *Nov. 1558.* Elizabeth, at her coming to the Crown, found the Archbishopric of Canterbury at her disposal; a post of great consequence with respect to the situation in which the Church of England was, as also with regard to the Queen's particular views. She thought no one more proper to fill that See than Matthew Parker. This Doctor had very reputably filled *Parker.* several stations in the reign of Henry the Eighth and Edward the Sixth; but being despoiled of all his dignities in the time of Queen Mary, he led a private life, and shut himself up amongst his books, in order to make study his principal entertainment.

As soon as Queen Elizabeth had ascended the throne, he was recalled to Court, and employed in the Reformation which that Princess proposed to establish in her dominions. As she thought Parker a fit person to further her designs, she at once fixed her eyes upon him, to raise him to the See of Canterbury. Accordingly, after the first measures necessary to be taken at the beginning of a new reign, she addressed, on the eighteenth of July 1559, a *congé d'élire*^a to the Chapter of Canterbury.

This Chapter was divided about the business of the Reformation; and those who were attached to the Catholic party absenting themselves, the others, although the fewer in number, chose, on the first of August, by way of compromise, Matthew Parker for their Archbishop, and certified this election to the Queen, in order that she might give it effect by her Letters Patent. *Elected.*

She did so^b, and on the ninth of September directed a Commission to Cuthbert Bishop of Durham, Gilbert Bishop

^a The Life of Matthew Parker, p. 52. [Rymer, vol. 15. p. 536.]

^b Life of Parker, p. 54.

CHAP.
II.

of Bath, David Bishop of Peterborough, Anthony Bishop of Landaff, William Barlow, Bishop, and John Scory also Bishop^c, for the Consecration and Confirmation of Parker. This Commission was never executed, for what reason is unknown. There is, however, some ground to believe that part of these Bishops, continuing Catholics, refused to take part in this Ordination, and that the time which passed between this first and the second Commission was employed in finding out other Bishops to substitute in the room of the former ones.

Be this as it may, the Queen had despatched, on the sixth of December^d, a second Commission, addressed to Anthony Bishop of Landaff, William Barlow formerly Bishop of Bath, now Bishop elect of Chichester, John Scory formerly Bishop of Chichester, now Bishop elect of Hereford, Miles Coverdale formerly Bishop of Exeter, Richard (for John) of Bedford, and John of Thetford, Suffragan Bishops, and John Bale Bishop of Ossory, to the end that all, or at least four of them, should proceed to the Consecration of Parker. These Letters Patent contain one clause which did not appear in the others, and which has since furnished the ground for an objection against this Ordination. It is that the Queen says, that she supplies by her own authority all that should be done upon this occasion contrary to the usages of the Realm, or to the Ecclesiastical Laws. *Supplentes nichilominus, suprema auctoritate nostra regia, ex mero motu ac certa scientia nostris, si quid, aut in hiis quæ juxta mandatum nostrum prædictum per vos fient, aut in vobis, aut vestrum aliquo, conditione, statu, facultate, vestris, ad præmissa perficienda, desit aut deerit eorum, quæ per statuta hujus regni, aut per leges ecclesiasticas, in hac parte requiruntur aut necessaria sunt, temporis ratione et rerum necessitate id postulante.*

Although Anthony Bishop of Landaff had taken the Oath of Supremacy, it appeared that he would not take part in this Consecration, on account either of his infirmities, or of his attachment to the Church, or for some other reason which we cannot divine. Thus Barlow found himself at the head of the Commission; and assisted by John Scory Bishop elect of Hereford, Miles Coverdale late Bishop of Exeter, and John

^{c d} Rymer, vol. 15. p. 541. and 549. See the Proofs.

Hodgskins Suffragan of Bedford, confirmed Parker's election Confirmed. on the ninth of December^e. The Record of Confirmation is found in Archbishop Bramhall's Works^f; and the author of the Life of Matthew Parker has also inserted several portions of it in his history.

The Consecration was put off for some days, and at length Conse-
crated. was performed at Lambeth, on Sunday the seventeenth of December 1559, by the same Bishops who had confirmed the election. The Record is found in Bramhall's Works, and in Burnet's History among the Records^g, and we shall insert a copy at the end of this work, as a document too essential to this See the
Proofs. Treatise to be omitted. By this Record we see clearly, that the Ritual of Edward the Sixth was exactly observed. For they began first with the morning prayers, after which the Bishop of Hereford preached the sermon before the ceremony began. Afterwards Parker was presented to Barlow, and when he had taken the oaths to the Queen, and the prayers prescribed in the new Ritual had been said, they laid their hands on him, saying to him in English, *Take the Holy Ghost, and remember that thou stir up the grace of God which is in thee by imposition of hands; &c.* They afterwards delivered the Bible into his hands, and communicated together, after which the ceremony ended. It is thus that this fact is given in the relation of which the original is preserved in the Registers of Canterbury^h, and in Corpus Christi College Library at Cambridgeⁱ; and we see that all that is there related agrees with the public Records which are found in Rymer's Collection, and in the Registers of Canterbury, against which one cannot object without having good reasons.

It is no doubt from these Registers that Camden, a contem- Camden. porary author, and one of the most exact and judicious writers England has produced, drew his account of this Ordination, entirely conformable to that we have just given. “^kMatthew

^e Life of Parker, p. 55.

^f [Page 1022.]

^g Bramhall, p. [1044. and] 1051. and Burnet, vol. 2. Appendix, p. 363.

^h [Copied, Bramhall, p. 1044.]

ⁱ [Copied, Bramhall, p. 1051. and Burnet, l. c.]

^k Matthæus Parkerus, vir pius, eruditus, et moribus modestissimis, qui Henrico VIII. a sacris, Collegiæ Ecclesiæ Stoke-Clare Decanus præfuerat, ad

Archiepiscopatum Cantuariensem rite electus, concione habita, Spiritu Sancto invocato, et Eucharistia celebrata, impositione manuum trium quondam Episcoporum, Gul. Barlovi Bathoniensis, Joan. Scorii Cicestriensis, Milonis Coverdali Exoniensis, et Joan. Suffraganei Bedfordiensis, Lambethæ consecratur. Ille postea consecravit Edmundum Grindallum, &c. *Camden. Annal. Eliz. p. 38. [† p. 49. Ed. Hearn.]*

CHAP. II. Parker," says he, "a pious and learned man, and of very modest behaviour, who being Chaplain in Ordinary to Henry the Eighth, had presided as Dean over the Collegiate Church of Stoke-Clare, having been duly elected Archbishop of Canterbury,—after the preaching of a Sermon, the invocation of the Holy Ghost, and the celebration of the Eucharist,—by the imposition of the hands of three late Bishops, namely, of William Barlow formerly Bishop of Bath, John Scory formerly Bishop of Chichester, and Miles Coverdale formerly Bishop of Exeter, and of John Suffragan Bishop of Bedford, was consecrated at Lambeth. He afterwards consecrated Edmund Grindal," &c. All this agrees perfectly with the Journal of the life of Parker, which was found after his death among his papers, and which Mr. Strype has printed among the documents annexed as proofs to his history, in which there are these remarkable words; "1 December 17, 1559. Was consecrated Archbishop of Canterbury. Alas! Alas! O Lord God, for what times hast thou preserved me!" &c. ; and we do not find that these so precise testimonies are destroyed or weakened by any proof or Record to the contrary.

Parker's
Journal.

Neal's
story.

Nevertheless, how reasonable soever it may seem to give credit rather to public and solemn Records, than to mere vague stories, yet several Catholic writers have not failed to lay great stress on an account altogether different from what has just been related. "m In the beginning of Queen Eliza-

¹ 17. Decembr. Ann. 1559. CONSECRATUS sum in Archiepiscopum Cantuarien. Heu ! Heu ! Domine Deus, in quæ tempora servasti me? &c. *Life of Parker, Appendix*, p. 15.

^m Initio regni Elizabethæ, depositis et in custodiam conjectis Catholicis Episcopis, ut infra videbimus, alii creandi, et illis suffiçienti erant. Qui fuerunt ad illam dignitatem nominati et electi, ex conducto in quodam hospitio (cui insigne erat Caput Mannuli, in vico dicto Cheapside) Londini convenerunt. Illuc etiam invitatus venit Landavensis Episcopus, multa senectute jam decrepitus, vir simplex et meticulosus. Ab ipso expectabant ordinationem novi candidati. Quod Bonerus Episcopus Londinensis, in carcere religionis ergo constitutus, subolfaciens, minatus est Landavensi excommunicationem si eos ordinaret: quo nuncio territus, et tactus etiam fortassis intrinsecus conscientie stimulis, ille pedem retulit, et oculorum infirmitatem causatus, manus eis im-

ponere recusavit. Expectantes ergo isti spe sua frustrati, se illusos interpretantes, senem, quem antea honore et reverentia non mediocri prosequabantur, opprobriis lacessere cœperunt, quidam inter illos dicentes: *Delirus iste senex existimat nos Episcopos non fore, nisi liniti et oleo delibuti fuerimus*; tam Episcopum senem quam Catholicum consecrationis ritum ludibrio habentes. Consecratore tamen frustrati, novum coguntur querere consilium, et ad Scoreum apostatam Monachum (qui sub Edvardo sexto absque ulla consecratione, ut statim videbimus, Episcopatum invaserat), ut ab eo ordinarerentur, recurrunt. Iste, qui cum habitu religioso conscientiam omnem exuerat, rem cito peregit, hac usus cæremonia. Illis omnibus ante ipsum genua flectentibus, unicuique illorum Biblia super caput imponens, dixit, *Accipite potestatem verbum Dei sincere prædicandi*. Et sic surrexerunt omnes Episcopi. *Champney de vocatione Ministrorum*, c. 14. p. 497.

beth's reign," says Champney upon the testimony of several writers, "the Catholic Bishops having been deposed and imprisoned, as we shall see hereafter, others were to be ordained and substituted in their places. They who were nominated and elected to that dignity met at London by appointment, in an Inn whose sign was a Nag's-head in the Street called Cheapside. Thither likewise, upon invitation, came the Bishop of Landaff, grown decrepid by reason of great age, a simple and timorous man. From him the new candidates expected Ordination. Which Bonner Bishop of London, then in prison on account of religion, getting scent of, threatened him of Landaff with excommunication if he ordained them; with which message being terrified, and perhaps also being inwardly touched with the stings of conscience, he drew back, and excusing himself on account of the infirmity of his eyes, refused to lay hands upon them. The new candidates being thus deceived in their expectations, and considering themselves mocked, began to revile the old man, whom they had before treated with no small honour and reverence, some of them saying, 'This old fool thinks we shall not be Bishops unless we are anointed and smeared with oil'; ridiculing as well the old Bishop as the Catholic rite of Consecration. Being deprived however of a Consecrator, they were forced to seek for a new expedient, and had recourse for their Ordination to Scory, an apostate Monk, who, without any Consecration, as we shall presently see, had invaded the Episcopate under Edward the Sixth. This man who, together with his religious habit, had put off all conscience, soon performed what they desired, using this ceremony. They all kneeling before him, laying the Bible upon the head of each of them, he said, 'Receive power to preach the word of God sincerely'; and thus they all rose up Bishops."

Champney adds, that he had this account from one named Thomas Bluet, who learnt it himself from Thomas Neal, then an officer of Bishop Bonner's, who had sent him to the Bishop of Landaff, to forbid him to proceed further under pain of excommunication, and to be a witness of what should take place there, and who actually was one.

Nothing seems more particular than such a testimony, but Refuted. when only hearsays are produced, it is rare to meet with truth.

CHAP.
II.

Nothing, in fact, is less consistent than this whole account, and its falsehood forces itself on the eyes of all the world. To put this beyond dispute, let us doubt, if you please, for a moment of the authenticity of this Record of Parker's Consecration, we cannot at least accuse as false and supposititious all those which Rymer has given us in his Collection of public Records. But the truth of these Instruments cannot subsist with the account of Neal as related by Champney.

For, 1. according to Neal, all the new Bishops were ordained together by Scory; and by Rymer's Collection, which agrees in this matter with Parker's Register, we find Commissions for the Ordinations of these Bishops of different dates, and the Register relates the different days on which these Ordinations were performed. Thusⁿ after the Consecration of Parker, which took place on the seventeenth of December, Parker himself consecrated four others on the twenty-first. Five more were consecrated on the twenty-first of January 15⁵²/₆₀; two on the second of March, and two more on the twenty-fourth of March. If then Neal's account is true, not only the Record of Parker's Ordination is false, but also all these different Records, and by consequence all the Queen's Commissions and Letters Patent, which are given us among the most authentic Records drawn from public Registers, are equally false.

2. We have found in the same Collection^o, the Act of the Investiture of the Archbishop of Canterbury in his temporalities, dated the twenty-first day of March, which agrees with the Record of Ordination such as we give it: we must suppose then that this new Record also is forged, and that it is not found in the Archives of the Realm, which is ridiculous.

3. What probability is there that these Bishops, whose interest required them at least to put the best face on their schism, should choose a tavern for such a ceremony, and moreover that they should be so imprudent as to make it so little a secret, as that it should have been able to come to the knowledge of the Bishop of London? That they should admit there unknown persons, such as Neal, and that a suspicious person should have been able to be witness of a proceeding it was so much their interest to conceal. Men so disposed as these Bishops

ⁿ Life of Parker, p. 63.

^o Rymer, vol. 15. p. 573.

are presumed to have been, would never have made all this ado: Consecration must have appeared to them very indifferent, and assuredly they might as well have had none^p at all, as that which the story supposes them to have received.

4. According to Sanders, notwithstanding the repeal of the old laws, Queen Elizabeth always took care that those whom she nominated for Bishops should be ordained with the ceremonies prescribed by the laws of the Realm. “^p Elizabeth indeed so conferred these [offices] by Letters Patent,” says this author, whose testimony cannot be suspected, “as that those on whom they were conferred were obliged to be ordained by certain persons, and by a certain ceremony, prescribed by the laws of the Realm.” But if in the first Ordination made at the beginning of the reign of that Princess, they had violated[!] the laws with as little precaution as the story of the tavern supposes, is there the least room to doubt that this author, so diligent to forget nothing that might blacken the new Ecclesiastical government introduced into England, would have animadverted on an Ordination so irregular, and not foregone a proof so clear and so convincing of the invalidity of their ministry?

5. The threat which Bonner is supposed to make is ridiculous: the Bishop of Landaff, who, although attached to the Catholic doctrine, had been so cowardly as to side with the Schism against his conscience, was he likely to be much concerned about an excommunication which he had already incurred by taking the Oath of Supremacy? And could Bonner himself suppose that the Bishop of Landaff would trouble himself much about it?

6. Neal's account states that Scory had intruded himself into the Episcopal function without ever having received Consecration. *Sub Edwardo sexto absque ulla consecratione Episcopatum invaserat.* But this fact is entirely false. He was consecrated by Cranmer, according to the new Ritual of Edward; and this is a fact publicly acknowledged by all historians. Cranmer's Register proves it. The author of the *Fasti Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ* marks the day of his Consecration;

^p Elizabetha quidem ita hæc [officia] per literas patentes conferebat, ut tamen oportuerit eos quibus collata erant, a certis personis, ac ritu etiam certo, secundum leges regni ordinari. *Sandersus de Schism. Ang.* lib. 3. p. 347.

CHAP. II. and it would be surprising that he should have been ignorant of it, if the account were not a tissue of falsehoods.

7. If this story had had but the shadow of truth, why was not Parker reproached with it in his own lifetime? And why did they not attempt to prove his Ordination null, because performed contrary to the laws and rules then in force, and by persons who could not be regarded as Bishops? In fact, this fable, which had its birth in the reign of King James the First, is not to be met with in any of the authors who have written in Parker's own time. Sanders himself, as I have already observed, makes no mention of it, and yet he would not have forgotten it, if he had heard it spoken of. There is some reason^q for thinking that the dinner which took place on the ninth of December, at the ceremony of Parker's Confirmation, but which was eight days before his Consecration, was what furnished the ground for this story, which was afterwards embellished with further fictions. But to convince one's self yet more clearly that all this is only a fable, it will be convenient to examine what is said against the authenticity of the Record we have given.

Objections
to the Re-
cord.

Three things are principally urged, in order to make it suspected of forgery. 1. That it was fifty years before it was produced. 2. That the persons who published it, having an interest in the forgery, ought to be suspected by us. 3. That the authors who have cited it giving different accounts of the names of the Consecrators, this disagreement marks evidently that it is forged. This is all that can be said with any tolerable plausibility to make our Record suspected, in opposition to the presumption which both the reading of the Record itself, and the authentic certificates which attest its truth and antiquity, form in its favour. But not to dwell upon bare presumptions, let us examine more particularly the difficulties brought against us.

First.

This Record, they say, was not produced until more than fifty years after the fact happened; and what likelihood is there that it should have been so long shut up, if the thing had been genuine? I doubt whether this objection is quite serious; because, in short, is it the custom to publish all the Records of ceremonies which take place? If the fable of

Answer.

^q [See the Life of Parker, p. 57; Bramhall, p. 446; and Burnet, Hist. Ref. vol. 2. p. 404. En.]

the Ordination at a tavern had been more ancient than it is, they would also have published sooner the proper Record to destroy it; but as it was known how the thing had taken place, what necessity was there to publish the relation of it? How many Records are kept shut up, which are not the less authentic for that reason? And besides, was it ever refused to be produced, or to be shewn to those who wished to assure themselves concerning it? It would be a strange thing if all the Records that have been kept private till now should become suspected, merely because they have never been produced. What would become of all our history, if, to establish suspicions, no more were necessary than to put forward that the Records were long kept secret?

Let us add that this Record was cited in Parker's own time, and this citation proves its existence. For in the Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury, published at London in 1572, before the death of Parker, it is written of him, "Accordingly, in the year of our Lord 1559, he was chosen Archbishop of Canterbury by the Dean and Chapter of the Metropolitan Church of Canterbury, and was afterwards in the same year, on the seventeenth of December, consecrated by means of four Bishops, William of Chichester, John of Hereford, Miles late Bishop of Exeter, and Richard (read John) of Bedford, required by a certain law enacted concerning this business." And there is this note in the margin, *Hæ consecrationes et confirmationes in Registris apparent.* "These Consecrations and Confirmations appear in the Registers." Camden, Godwin, Hall, and other writers, were acquainted with this Record, and cited it, without any one's daring to charge the Registers with forgery. But what Godwin relates is still stronger, and puts the matter out of dispute.

Cited in
1572.

George Abbot Archbishop of Canterbury^s, being willing to convince Fitzherbert how little foundation there was for those suspicions to which he gave weight against the Registers, and to confute him by shewing them to Catholics, as he had wished, caused four Catholics to come to him, three whereof

Examined
by Roman
Catholics.

^r Anno itaque Domini 1559, Cantuariensis Archiepiscopus electus est a Decano et Capitulo Ecclesie Metropolitanice Cantuariensis. Posteaque eodem anno, 17. die Decembris, adhibitis quatuor Episcopis, W. Cicestrensi, Johanne

Herefordensi, Milone quondam Exoniensi, et Richardo (leg. Johanne) Bedfordensi, lege quadam de hac re lata requisitis, consecratus est. *Life of Parker, Appendix*, p. 151.

^s Godwin de Præs. Angliæ, p. 219.

CHAP. II. were Jesuits, and in the presence of the Bishops of London, Durham, Ely, Bath, Lincoln, and Rochester, suffered them to examine the Register as much as they pleased. They did so, and promised to testify it to Fitzherbert. It is true that, being again remanded to prison, and having required that the book should be put into their hands, that they might examine it with greater attention, they were refused, and only told that those books were not allowed to be removed; that they might examine them again upon the place, but that they would not trust them in their hands. This refusal is insisted upon to give a colour to the charge of forgery. But, in truth, was this a reasonable request? And ought they not to have expected such an answer? If this were sufficient to create a suspicion that the Registers were forged, what Record can be free from suspicion? nothing being so unusual as to entrust to strangers or to enemies essential documents whose preservation is of immeasurable importance.

Again
lately.

In circumstances where nothing of this nature was to be apprehended, the inspection and examination of these Registers has always been permitted without the least difficulty. I can affirm this from my own experience. In pursuance of the design I had formed of assuring myself more strongly of the authenticity of these Records, though I was unknown to the Archbishop of Canterbury, yet, upon my bare application, he kindly permitted a new examination to be made in the presence of four witnesses, two whereof are Catholics, and the other two of the Church of England. It will appear by the certificate which I have inserted among my Proofs, (the original whereof I have deposited in the King's Library^t, to be annexed to Bramhall's works, which are there,) that the Record printed in Bramhall's book is entirely conformable to the Registers. And this Prelate in sending it me, assures me, by his letter of the twenty-first of February, old style, 172½, that the writing is of the same time, and by the same hand with the rest of the following Records in the same Register; so that if these former Records are false, we must suppose that all the others, even those that regard affairs purely civil, are so also; a thing which cannot be maintained.

^t [† The King of France's Library at Paris.]

“In answer,” says the Archbishop, “that you may depend upon it, that the whole entry of the Acts of M. Parker’s Consecration, with all the Instruments relating to it, in my Registers, are written in the same hand with the other Acts of what passed during his Archiepiscopate, and all at the time that they were done.”

This first objection then is rather unreasonable ; but it is not on this that they insist most, but on another, namely, that this Record and these Registers have been produced only by those who were interested to falsify them, and who, being the sole guardians of these monuments, could with impunity forge or at least alter them. Suspensions, it is true, are ordinarily and mutually raised by all parties, and it is a scandal to mankind, that they have, by frequent frauds, given cause to think that probity and good faith cannot subsist among men of different interests, and differing sentiments. Nevertheless justice requires that we should not give weight to such suspicions, unless there be further some proofs of forgery or alteration. But there are many reasons that evince that there is nothing of this kind in this case.

The first, which we have already touched upon before, is that no body can accuse the Record of Parker’s Consecration, or the Registers wherein it is recorded, of forgery or corruption, without throwing the same suspicion on the public Records collected by Rymer. For we see that the Records in that Collection, as well with regard to the substance, as to the dates, agree perfectly with our Record, and with the Registers. But where there is a harmony so perfect, what likelihood is there of forgery? And how can an endless uncertainty of fact be avoided in history, if, without proof, and without foundation, the slightest suspicions and the most unreasonable prejudices are to suffice to discredit Records which the public faith has rendered sacred?

A second reason which ought to appear convincing is, that if they had wished to forge Records, they would not have confined themselves to these, and they would have dressed them up otherwise than they are. First, they would have given us the Record of Barlow’s Consecration, which is so essential in this affair. They would have omitted the clause in the Mandate for Parker’s Consecration from which so

CHAP. much advantage is endeavoured to be taken against him.
 II. In a word, they would have omitted nothing essential, nor inserted any thing that was to their prejudice. Besides, if they were to forge a relation, why should they not make the Consecration to have been performed according to the rites of the Roman Pontifical, rather than according to King Edward's Ordinal. It would have cost them no more forgery, and they would thereby have prejudiced the Catholics in favour of their Ordination, which it was their interest to do. This, nevertheless, was not done. The forgery is therefore a mere chimera, and has no other foundation than an unreasonable distrust and prejudice.

III. "The Record variously cited."

The variations which are found among the different authors who cite the Registers, form the third objection to their authenticity, and this, in my opinion, has the greatest show of truth, and is the most reasonable. This disagreement is very certain. For one says that Parker was consecrated by Barlow, Scory, Coverdale, and John Suffragan of Dover. Sutcliffe joins to the three first two Suffragans. The author of the Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury, joins to the three Bishops but one Suffragan, who is Richard Suffragan of Bedford. Mason agrees with this latter as to the number; but he calls the Suffragan, John. Lastly, the Commission of the sixth of December, which is found in Rymer, names seven to whom the Mandate for Consecration is addressed; that is to say, the Bishop of Landaff, Barlow, Scory, Coverdale, Richard Suffragan of Bedford, John Suffragan of Thetford, and the Bishop of Ossory in Ireland. Thus we have five differing accounts in the case of a single fact. What are we to believe amidst so much variety? And what greater proof of forgery in a Record, than the contrariety which is found amongst those that cite it?

Answer.

This difficulty may stagger one at first; but as the disagreement, which at first seems considerable, reduces itself at the bottom to a little matter, the difficulty falls to the ground at the same time, as we are about to shew.

First, the Queen's Letters Patent for the Consecration of Parker must not be regarded as a side of the question and a variation. She addresses her Letters to seven, but the same Letters express, that it is enough that four of them execute

that Commission. *Quatenus vos, aut ad minus quatuor vestrum, —eundem Magistrum Matheum Parker in Archiepiscopum et Pastorem Ecclesiæ prædictæ consecrare—velitis cum effectu.* But this is what Mason, the author of the Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury, and Butler, and since them Bramhall, Burnet, Collier, and all the rest agree with.

If Sutcliffe mentions two Suffragans, it is because he was deceived by the Queen's Letters, in which there were two actually named, and did not observe that the Record inserted in the Registers mentioned but one. And as to Butler, who names a different Suffragan, if it be not a fault of the transcriber or of the printer, this author could not have consulted the Registers, and must have cited them no otherwise than upon hearsay, and with a bad memory.

The last difference is nothing. The Suffragan of Bedford is called Richard by some, and John by others. The cause of this difference comes from the Letters, which give him in fact the name of Richard incorrectly for that of John. Some then have kept to the Record of Consecration, others have thought it right to reform it by the Queen's Letters; and this is what has produced this slight difference, which we easily see is not at all essential.

But what ought here to be observed is, that those who have published the Record itself, have always agreed. Bramhall and Burnet have published it entire. Mason and Collier have given either large extracts, or the substance of the whole; and we find no disagreement in what they have published. The variations in question, then, do not come from the Record, and ought not to be produced as a proof of its being a forgery.

Before this Record had been made public, there is reason to believe that it was cited only upon unfaithful reports, or mistaken memory. But is it surprising if such citations are not always given exactly? And should a man dare for such slight variations to condemn a Record on the substance of which all agree? For, as we have seen, all allow that the Ordination was performed by Barlow, Scory, and Coverdale. All, except one author who mentions two, add one Suffragan; and if they do not agree in the name, we see the reason clearly in the Queen's Letters, wherein he is found wrongly named.

CHAP.
II.

These differences therefore do not prove that there were different Records of this Consecration, but that the one in the Registers was not always carefully consulted by those who quoted it; and this is what we see daily instances of among those who cite manuscripts, whose citations are found defective by those who consult them more carefully afterwards; because the former, whether from precipitation, or from forgetfulness, or from inadvertency, have not always read or cited exactly.

Lastly, the Record exists still in the Registers, which have not changed. It is more than a hundred years that it has been seen such as it subsists at this day. Those who have cited it differently may have done so by hearsay. There is no difference except about one fact. This fact is only one name put for another. Even the variety in these citations, proves that there had been neither collusion nor bad faith, but that they did not think fit to conceal, in favour of their own party, the blunders made by unexact writers, in giving wrongly important facts. All these circumstances united, shew that the differences objected are insufficient to prove the Record in question a forgery; and that, in spite of these disagreements, it retains its whole authority; especially after the authentic certificates given by public characters to attest that the Record is such as it has been published.

Objection. But, it is objected, many writers contemporary with Parker highly reproached him, as well as the other new Bishops, that they had not been consecrated: the Record of Consecration then is forged; and if the story of the tavern is not true, it is at all events true that there was no real Ordination.

Answer. This consequence might appear well grounded in their opinion who made these reproaches, without the Record's being forged. These Bishops, according to them, were not consecrated, because they were not ordained by that form which appeared to them essential, and because they did not regard as Bishops those who consecrated them. They might therefore think the Record of Consecration genuine, and yet believe that these Bishops were not consecrated; because the Record in question mentioned only a Consecration which they considered entirely invalid. This is what evidently appears from Stapleton's way of reasoning against Horn

Bishop of Winchester; “^u Who knows not,” says he, “that you and your colleagues were ordained, I will not say otherwise than the Canons of the Church require, but not even according to the direction of your own Statutes?” It was not then an entire omission of Consecration, but the want of a Canonical Consecration, with which he reproached him: it was a Canonical Consecration which he defied him to prove: ^x *Nec approbatam et assuetam vocationem aut consecrationem ostendere unquam poteris.* It is in this sense that they upbraided the new Bishops with not being Bishops, and with not having been ordained. But is there the least room to conclude from such a way of reasoning, that the Record of Parker's Consecration is forged, when if it be looked upon as genuine, the argument still retains its whole force?

In default of positive proofs, they have recourse to negative ones, to weaken the truth of the Records preserved in the Registers, and to endeavour to support the fable of the tavern, which falls to pieces on every side. Not even the silence of Stow, the celebrated English Chronographer, can escape being made by Champney to weigh against the Ordination of Parker, which he does not mention, says he^y, because if he had related in what manner things were performed at the Nag's-head, he could not have failed to bring upon himself the anger of those whose interest it was to bury in oblivion so scandalous a story. It is true, that to draw advantage from a silence so equivocal, he is made to confide to his friends in private what he did not dare to publish in writing^z: but, unluckily for Champney, these friends are dumb witnesses, who are no proof, and in a matter of testimony and dispute are of no authority.

In fact, to destroy the advantage which it is wished to draw from this pretended silence, and to convince these dumb witnesses, produced by Champney, of falsehood, it is sufficient to remark, that if the history of the Ordination performed at the Nag's-head be true, not only Parker, but all the new Bishops nominated with him by Queen Elizabeth, had no other Ordination. Nevertheless, according to Stow^a, in his

^u Quis nescit, te tuosque collegas, non dico aliter quam requirunt Canones Ecclesie, sed nec secundum præscriptum Statutorum vestrorum ordinatos esse? *Stapletoni Opera*, vol. 2. p. 839, 840.

^x [Ibid. p. 839.]

^y De Vocat. Minist. cap. 14. p. 502. [et 504.]

^z [Ibid. p. 501.]

^a The Survey of London, p. 491. [p. 533. Ed. 1633.]

Silence
of Stow.

Answer.

CHAP.
II.

Description of the Antiquities of the City of London, Grindal, who was one of the new Bishops nominated at the same time with Parker, was not consecrated till the 21st of December 1559. Now this fact alone, related by Stow, destroys the history of the Nag's-head, the argument brought from his silence in his Chronicle, and the pretended secret confided to his dumb friends, who say nothing at all. For, to agree with the Nag's-head fable, the Ordination of Parker, of Grindal, and of the rest, should have been performed in the month of September 1559, by Scory. But according to Stow, Grindal was not ordained until the 21st of December the same year, by Parker. He was ignorant therefore of the Nag's-head fable, and could not confide it to any secret friends; and seeing his testimony agrees with Parker's Register, and Rymer's Records, he therefore bears witness to the authenticity of these Records, and consequently decides in favour of the account of Parker's Consecration, against the fable of the tavern.

Let people, after this, judge as they will of the silence which Stow has kept in his Chronicle; it is certain that it cannot have been from the motive alleged, that he has so done. Perhaps he thought it enough to have mentioned Parker's Election, without speaking of his Consecration. Perhaps he thought it unnecessary to give the particulars of a ceremony in which they did but renew what was done in the time of King Edward. In fine, perhaps he had not seen the Record of Parker's Consecration, which was not as yet published, and without which he could not exactly describe this ceremony. But, let what will be the cause of his silence (for one may imagine an infinity), it is at all events very evident, from the facts he relates in his History of London, that nothing can be concluded from it contrary to the account preserved in the Registers, or in favour of the story of the tavern, which his testimony destroys.

A last resource.

Finally, the last resource in favour of the fable, and in opposition to the relation, is that the first three Bishops nominated in the Commission issued the ninth of September 1559 for the Consecration of Parker, viz. Tonstal Bishop of Durham, Bourne Bishop of Bath, and Pole Bishop of Peterborough, were deposed in the month of July the same year,

according to Stow's Chronicle, for refusing to take the Oath of Supremacy. But, say they, there is no likelihood that the Queen would have chosen to employ for the Consecration of Parker, Bishops whom she had just deposed two months before: this Commission is therefore forged; and if this first be so, it is highly probable that that of the sixth of December is of the same stamp, and consequently also the account of the Ordination performed in pursuance of this latter Commission: there was therefore no other Consecration but that which took place at the Nag's-head in London, in the month of September 1559.

If this be the last resource in favour of this fable, I think it Answer. will readily be allowed, that to have recourse to such defences, is to have no defence at all. I agree that it really is highly improbable, that the Queen should choose to nominate for the Consecration of Parker, Bishops whom she had caused to be deposed two months before. But what should thence have been concluded, is not that this Commission was forged; but that then, namely, on the ninth of September 1559, these three Bishops had not as yet been deposed, as may easily be proved by facts not at all doubtful.

For, 1. as to the Bishop of Durham, it appears by a manu- The fact not true. script in the Cotton Library, cited by Mr. Strype, in his Annals of the Reformation^b, that he was not dispossessed of his Bishopric till the twenty-ninth of September 1559. This manuscript is supported by another proof, which can still less be objected to, viz. the Registers of the Chapter of Durham, where we find even to the seventeenth of September, that is to say, eight entire days after the Commission of the ninth, acts of jurisdiction exercised by Tonsal, and confirmed by the Chapter: he was therefore until then in peaceable possession of that Church, and his deposition must be posterior to these acts, and consequently to the Commission of the ninth; and this agrees with the manuscript, which does not mention it till the twenty-ninth.

2. The thing is yet more evident with regard to Bourne Bishop of Bath; for all agree, that this Bishop, like the rest, was deposed only because he refused to take the Oath of

^b Vol. 3. p. 144. [vol. 1. p. 112. Ed. 1725—31.]

CHAP.
II.

Supremacy. But the Oath of Supremacy was not tendered him until the end of October 1559. Rymer^c furnishes us with a proof; for we find in his Collection, a Commission dated the eighteenth of October, to tender him the Oath of Supremacy. He had not, then, refused it as yet; and consequently his deposition, which supposes that refusal, is long posterior to the Commission dated September the ninth, and *a fortiori* cannot have been in the month of July 1559.

3. As to Pole Bishop of Peterborough, he cannot have been dispossessed until about the same time that the Bishop of Bath was, that is to say, about the latter end of October, or the beginning of November. For by the Register of the Church of Peterborough, we find acts of jurisdiction exercised by him up to the end of September; and besides, the Chapter of Canterbury, who, during the vacancy of the Metropolitan See, exercised the Metropolitan jurisdiction over the vacant Churches depending on Canterbury, did not take upon them the government of the Church of Peterborough till the eleventh of November 1559^d. Therefore Pole's deposition could not be long before that time; and at all events, it is certain that it was long after the ninth of September, which is the date of the first Commission. This Commission therefore is not forged, as they conclude it from a fact notoriously false; and, on the contrary, all these several Records agree so exactly that they support one another, and that it is impossible to dispute their truth without destroying the whole certainty of history.

Stow explained.

But nevertheless, it is said, Stow sets down the deposition of the Bishops in the month of July 1559. It is true: but his testimony is framed in such a manner, that no use can be made of it. For, first, Stow does not say that the three particular Bishops here spoken of were deposed at that time. Secondly, what he does say may easily be reconciled, without contradicting the facts we have just given.

In fact, the Queen's first Commission for causing the Oath of Supremacy to be taken by the Bishops and others having been issued in the month of May 1559, the Oath was accordingly tendered to several in that same month, as well as in the

^c Vol. 15. p. 545.

^d Ant. Harmer, p. 151.

months of June and July following, and upon their refusal, several were deposed at that time. If then Stow is to be understood but of some Bishops, it is very certain that there were some deposed in the month of July, as Heath Archbishop of York^e, Thirlby Bishop of Ely^e, &c. But it is very false that all were deposed at the same time, and we have authentic dates of the deposition of many in the following months. The testimony of Stow then is here produced irrelevantly, and can have no weight, because he does not say what they would have him say; and because if he did, he would evidently be convicted of falsehood.

It ought therefore to stand as certain, that the Record of Parker's Ordination, such as it is produced from the Registers, is authentic; that the story of the Cheapside Ordination is ridiculous; that a hearsay of an unknown person cannot be brought in competition with the Records which remain in the public Registers; that even setting testimony against testimony, one ought to give credit much rather to that of the Earl of Nottingham, High Admiral of England, who was present at the ceremony, and at the dinner given at the Palace of Lambeth, than that of an unknown person like Neal; and, since there are several obvious falsehoods found in Neal's account, which moreover contradicts all the public Records, there is not the least room to hesitate with respect to the preference which ought to be given to the truth above the fable, of which the pretended narration of Champney has all the marks.

Let us add, before we finish upon this head, that as falsehood can be supported only by falsehood, so to support the story of the Nag's-head, recourse was had to feigned witnesses, such as the Bishop of Durham, born three years after the Consecration of Parker, and whom they apparently thought dead when they produced his testimony. It will be seen however by the documents we have published among the Records annexed to this Treatise, that this testimony is disowned by the Bishop himself, and by several Lords of Parliament, both spiritual and temporal, and that they attest the truth of the Ordination, such as we have set it forth, drawn from the public Registers.

^{c c} Strype's Annals, vol. 3. p. 143. [vol. 1. p. 141. Ed. 1725—31.]

CHAP. III.

BARLOW, PARKER'S CONSECRATOR, WAS HIMSELF CONSECRATED.
PROOFS OF THIS CONSECRATION.

CHAP.
III.

As few at this day dispute the authenticity of the Records which prove the Ordination of Parker, those who attack the validity of the English Ordinations, without stopping to contest the truth of the relation which contains the proof and history of the Consecration of this Prelate, who is the stem of the new Ministry, pretend to destroy this Ordination by two facts; which if they could be proved true, would ruin it past all remedy. The first regards Barlow, Parker's Consecrator; and the other is the form he used in the ceremony of this Ordination. It is pretended, then, that Barlow was not consecrated himself, and that the Rite of which he made use is entirely insufficient to ensure the validity of Ordination. Either the one or the other of these facts would be sufficient of itself to annihilate the English Hierarchy: they cannot then be examined with too great attention and exactness, and we shall begin with that of Barlow.

Three objections.

Our business is to ascertain whether he was ever consecrated. M. L'Abbé Renaudot denies it, or at least throws out in his Memoire such considerable doubts on this point as are equivalent to entirely denying it. Three things are principally insisted upon to support this doubt. The first is, that Cranmer's Register, which contains the Ordinations performed by that Prelate, or by his order, does not contain that of Barlow, and that the Record of it could never be found. The second, which he thinks demonstrative, is, that in Rymer's Collection^a, there is a Commission of the Queen's addressed to Parker, already consecrated Archbishop of Canterbury, to confirm and consecrate Barlow Bishop of Chichester. But, it is said, if he had been consecrated when he ordained Parker, would Parker have received a Commission to consecrate him him-

^a Vol. 15. p. 550.

self? The third is, that Bonner Bishop of London, having had Anthony Bishop of Landaff threatened with excommunication, if he meddled in the Ordination of Parker, would not have failed to make the same threat to Barlow likewise, if he had thought him a Bishop; and that his not having done it is a proof that he did not believe him such, although he could not have been ignorant of it, had the thing been true.

But before we proceed to examine these difficulties, it will be convenient to set forth the proofs we find of Barlow's Consecration. I shall not dwell on the testimony of Godwin, which M. L'Abbé Renaudot rejects, because this author is in his opinion not very exact. He says positively that Barlow was consecrated in the month of February 1535. "^b William Barlow, Prior of the Canons Regular of Bisham, was consecrated February 22, 1535. Afterwards, in the month of April following, he was translated to St. David's." But not to insist upon this testimony, I proceed to other less suspected and more certain proofs.

All are sufficiently aware of the exactness of Wharton, the author of the *Anglia Sacra*. See what he says of William Barlow in the catalogue he has given of the Bishops of St. Asaph. "^c William Barlow, at that time Prior of the Canons Regular of Bisham, of the Order of St. Augustine, having been elected Bishop by the Dean and Chapter of St. Asaph in the year 1536, January the sixteenth, was confirmed on the twenty-third of February following by Thomas Archbishop of Canterbury."

The author of the *Fasti Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ*, who appears to have laboured with great exactness, and among very authentic documents, expresses himself after the same manner with Wharton. "William Barlow, S. T. P." says this author^d, writing in English, "was elected Jan. 16. 1535, confirmed Febr. 23. following." Neither the one nor the other really speak of any thing but his Confirmation; but

^b Gulielmus Barlow, Canonicorum Regularium apud Bisham Prior, consecratus est Febr. 22. 1535. Aprili deinde mense sequente Meneviam translatus est. *Godwin. de Præsulibus Angliæ*, p. 663.

^c Willelmus Barlow, tunc Prior Canonicorum Regularium de Bisham, Ordi-

nis Augustiniani, a Decano et Capitulo Assavensi in Episcopum electus anno 1536, Januarii 16, a Thoma Archiepiscopo Cant. die 23. Februarii sequentis confirmatus est. *De Episc. Lond. et Assar.* p. 359.

^d *Fasti Eecl. Angl.* p. 22.

CHAP.
III.

the Consecration cannot have been delayed long after the Confirmation, both because the laws made by Henry the Eighth fixed at twenty days the time within which the ceremony must be performed without further delay, on pain of incurring the penalties of a Præmunire, and also because in the month of April following, there is proof that Barlow was already consecrated, as will appear in the following part of this chapter. Mr. Strype also, the author of the Life of Cranmer^e, without any hesitation, places Barlow's Consecration in the year 1535, at the same time observing that the Record of it was not inserted in the Registers, any more than that of the Consecration of Edward Fox for the Bishopric of Hereford, which was performed the same year; and of which the Record was recovered from another place, according to the author of the *Fasti Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ*.

Strype.

Silence
of the
Register.

The silence then of Cranmer's Register is no decisive proof of the omission of this Consecration. For, as it has been very well observed by Francis Mason^f, in his *Defence of the Ministry of the Church of England*, there are many others who have also been omitted, whose Consecrations are notwithstanding very certain. For instance, Gardiner's Consecration cannot be found in the Register of Canterbury: is it the less certain for that? That of Fox, as I have observed, was equally omitted. If the Record of it, which was found elsewhere, did not appear, should we have any better foundation for calling it in question, because the Register of Canterbury makes no mention of it? We see no mention made in Cranmer's Register of the Ordination of King, Suffragan Bishop of Lincoln^g: yet we do not doubt that it was very real, and we even know that it took place in 1541. The author of a Letter which has lately been published on the Succession of the English Bishops, and who has himself consulted the Registers of Canterbury, gives account of a considerable number of omissions of the same kind. For, according to him, without mentioning Fox's and Gardiner's Consecrations, which are not found, how many others are omitted? "h We confess," says this author, "that

^e Memorials of Cranmer, p. 37.

^f *Vindiciæ Eccl. Angl. lib. 3. c. 10.*
p. 369.

^g Memorials of Cranmer, p. 95.

^h *Fatemur in Registro Cranmeri non
reperiri Consecrationem Barlowii, sed nec*

the Consecration of Barlow is not to be found in Cranmer's Register, nor yet those of several other Bishops, about whose Ordination, however, no one ever yet doubted. Such are those of Fox Bishop of Hereford, Sampson of Chichester, Bell of Worcester, Day of Chichester; all whose Consecrations, if I have not very hastily run over that Register, are entirely omitted. What shall I say of Gardiner Bishop of Winchester, Latimer of Worcester, White of Lincoln, Bayne of Lichfield, Turberville of Exeter, Hopton of Norwich, Goldwell of St. Asaph, whose Confirmations and Consecrations, if I am not very much mistaken, are not to be found now in the Archiepiscopal Registers?" Silence, then, is no convincing proof, when we have from other sources positive facts which supply its absence, as in this case.

There might, perhaps, be some objection made to these first Apparent difficulty. authorities, because Wharton places Barlow's Consecration in the year 1536, whereas all the others mention it 1535: but this difference proceeds only from the different way of reckoning. Wharton beginning the year with the first of January, according to the new style, was obliged to place it in 1536; whereas the others following the English account, by which the year does not begin till the twenty-fifth of March, were equally obliged to fix it in 1535, because the Consecration having taken place in the month of February, the year 1536 was not yet begun.

Nothing is more easy than to reconcile in this way authors who seem to contradict one another. But how, it may be Error of Strype. asked, can we reconcile with the other writers the author of Cranmer's Lifeⁱ, who dates this Consecration on the twenty-

aliorum plurimorum Episcoporum, de quorum tamen Ordinatione nunquam adhuc a quoquam fuit dubitatum: Foxii Herefordensis Episcopi, Sampsonis Cicestrensis, Belli Wigorniensis, Daili Cicestrensis, quorum omnium Consecrationes aut ego festinanter admodum illum Registrum pereurri, aut in eo plane desiderantur. Quid dicam de Gardinero Wintoniensi, de Latimero Wigorniensis, de Whiteo Lincolnensi, de Bayno Lichfeldensi, de Turberville Exoniensi, Hoptono Norwicensi, Goldwello Asaphensi Episcopis; quorum aut ego egregie fallor, aut nec Confirmatio nec Consecratio in Registris Ar-

chiepiscopalibus hoc tempore habentur? *De Vera et non Interrupta Episc. Ang. Successione Epist.* p. 16.

ⁱ It is a misfortune that must attend ordinary readers, in their perusal of the several laborious tracts published by Mr. Strype, to be led into errors; few writers having committed more mistakes than he has done, which weak or malicious adversaries may one time or other make ill uses of. His writings will not always fall into the hands of such candid, judicious readers as our author is; and therefore it would be an act of great charity, or rather justice, to the public, and reputation to himself, to review

CHAP. III. sixth of September 1535? I own it cannot be attempted, it being a plain error, as the *congé d'élire*^k bears date only the seventh of January 1535⁶, and the election was made the sixteenth; the Mandate to confirm and consecrate was not till the twenty-second of February. The cause of this author's mistake was, that having placed the Consecration of Fox Bishop of Hereford¹ on the twenty-sixth of September 1535, and designing to acquaint his readers that the Record of it had not been inserted in the Registers, any more than that of Barlow's, he forgot to date the Consecration of the latter; mentioning both together, as if both had been of the same date.

Statute of
Henry the
Eighth.

But not to insist any more on these authorities, there are facts still more definite, which ascertain Barlow's Consecration. 1. M. L'Abbé Renaudot and all the rest agree that in Henry the Eighth's reign, with the exception of the Oath of Obedience to the Pope, there was no innovation made in the Consecration of Bishops. Nay further, by a law made in the twenty-fifth year of this King, that is to say, in 1533, and consequently before Barlow's Consecration, all Archbishops and Bishops to whom the King's Mandate for Consecration is directed, are forbidden, under the penalties of a Præmunire, to delay more than twenty days to perform it. ^m "That—if any
" Archbishop or Bishop—do not—consecrate with all due cir-
" cumstance—every such person as shall be so elected—within
" twenty days next after the King's Letters Patents—shall
" come into their hands,—(he) shall run in the dangers, pains
" and penalties of the Estatute of Provision and Præmunire." Is it likely then that Barlow should exercise the office of a Bishop, during the remainder of that Prince's life, which was more than ten years, without any trouble given either to himself, or to the Bishops to whom the Mandate had been directed on the twenty-second of February 1535⁶, as appears by the Record of it which is found in Rymer's Collection ⁿ?

Investi-
ture.

2. ^o I here omit the proof produced by some people in

what he has already written; for I have ocular demonstration that his very numerous escapes would make a competent volume. Would he take leave of the world with his retractations, how beneficent, how praiseworthy an attempt would that be! I can promise him large collections on this subject. Here is a complication of mistakes detected by

our dispassionate author. D. W.

^k Rymer, vol. 14. p. 558.

¹ Memorials of Cranmer, p. 37.

^m Statutes at large, vol. 1. p. 426.

This Statute is among the Proofs.

ⁿ Vol. 14. p. 559.

^o Here the learned author has thought fit to cancel somewhat more than two pages, beginning at 2° in p. 51. of the

favour of Barlow's Ordination, taken from the restitution which was granted him to his temporalities; which restitution is not ordinarily granted till after the Consecration is certified by the Metropolitan to the King; but since the Kings of England often dispensed with this usage, the argument is too weak not to be contested by those who are interested to confute the most solid arguments. But as for that drawn from the custom of the Bishops not sitting in Parliament until after their Consecration, this is what I must not omit; since, if it is not absolutely demonstrative, it is at least solid enough to form the strongest presumption in favour of Barlow's Consecration.

3. In short, it is an indisputable fact, that although before Edward the Third, there are some examples of Bishops sitting in Parliament before their Consecration, there is not one to be met with of their sitting there since his time, that is to say, for nearly 400 years; and that all the English writers regard the usage to the contrary as having, in some measure, the force of a law. The author of the Polity of the Church of England sets down this order in express words: *Confirmati consecrantur; et cum consecrati homagii juramentum Regi præstiterint, et Rex illis vicissim suorum Episcopatum possessiones restituerit . . . his honoribus potiuntur. Titulum habent Dominorum ratione Baroniarum suis Episcopatibus annexarum, et præcedentiam præ aliis Regni Baronibus non modo in privatis congressibus, sed in supremo Regni Concilio, Parlamento.* First the Consecration, next the homage, after this the investiture of their possessions; and lastly, the enjoyment of the honours and prerogatives annexed to this dignity.

Archbishop Bramhall explains all this to us more at large. "The Chapter," says he^q, "cannot elect without the King's *Congé d'Eslire*. The King never grants Letters Patents for Confirmation and Consecration, until he have a certificate of the Dean and Chapter's Election. The Dean of the Arches never confirms until he have the King's Commission. The Archbishop never consecrates until the Election be confirmed. And lastly, the King never receiveth homage for the Bishopric,

French Edition, and substituted this short paragraph [and the first two words of the next] in their stead. [D. W.]

^p Polit. Eccl. Angl. c. 5. p. 39, 40.

^q Bramhall's Works, vol. 1. p. 482.

CHAP. III. or giveth the temporalities, nor the Dean and Chapter enthroned, until after the Consecration." And the Bishop cannot perform his ordinary jurisdiction, but as he is a consecrated Bishop, and after being invested.

Burnet. Bishop Burnet, who must have been very well acquainted with the custom in this respect, attests the same thing in his History^r. The rule is, according to him, that to have a seat in the House of Lords, it is necessary to present the King's Warrant by virtue of which one was put into possession of the temporalities; and this Instrument, as we have seen, is not given but upon the certificate of Consecration. I have the same thing further confirmed to me quite lately by a letter from Daniel Pulteney, Esq. to one of my friends, of the twenty-seventh of March 1721. It says that, though there is no express law on the subject, it is the established usage of England not to admit the Bishops to Parliament until after their Consecration. The same thing appears also from a letter^s of an English scholar, who adds further, that according to the custom of that kingdom, when the new Bishop is not yet confirmed in his See, it is not he that is summoned to Parliament, but the Ecclesiastic appointed by the Archbishop to exercise spiritual jurisdiction during the vacancy of the See; who, in England, is styled Guardian of the Spiritualities^t. But both in the Writs and in the Sessions of Parliament held under Henry the Eighth, from the year 1536, Barlow was summoned with the rest, and was present there, not as Guardian of the Spiritualities, nor yet as Bishop "elect and confirmed", but purely and simply as Bishop, and even took precedence therein of other Bishops, who certainly had been consecrated. In Rymer's Collection^u we have two Writs for calling Parliaments, one in 1536, the other in 1541. In both these the Bishop of St. David's, who then was Barlow, is summoned to it like the rest. He was consecrated then, at the latest, in the month of April 1536; for the Parliament of this year was summoned the twenty-seventh of April^x.

Private letters.

Barlow summoned with the rest.

^r History of the Reformation, vol. 2. p. 404.

^s Some extracts from this letter will be found among the Proofs.

^t *Custos spiritualitatis*.

^u Vol. 14. p. 563. and 737.

^x N.B. The author ordered two lines to be omitted here which are in the Original; and some other little alterations were also made at the close of this paragraph: this was thought too inconsiderable to be inserted, as the

Mason^y adds, that in the Parliament of 1539, Barlow, then Sits. Bishop of St. David's, made his appearance in person twenty-seven times in the first Session, and fifteen times in the second. He was therefore ^{certainly} consecrated before, and this fact [is not to be] ^{proved it} doubted of^z.]

4. At the same time with the Parliament of 1536 assembled ^{In Convocation.} the Convocation of the Clergy, where several propositions were presented in order to be condemned, and where some articles were drawn up, which the King caused to be published in his name. This list was subscribed by eighteen Bishops, amongst whom Barlow's name appears as Bishop of St. David's^a. His name is even placed before that of Robert Warton Bishop of St. Asaph, who was consecrated the second of July 1536. Barlow was therefore consecrated before him; for under Henry the Eighth, in whose time the Ecclesiastical rules of this kind were observed with sufficient exactness, he never would have taken his place in the Convocation, nor signed before a consecrated Bishop, if he had not himself been consecrated before. Moreover, he was present at the several Synods of 1537^b, of 1540, and 1552, and subscribed there as Bishop of St. David's and of Bath, without our finding that any difficulty was raised on the subject of his Consecration. But would he have been allowed to take place and subscribe before consecrated Bishops, if he had not been consecrated himself? And that the more, because the constant usage of England is^c, that unconsecrated Bishops are not present at its Synods; or if they are present, that they sit below the consecrated Bishops; and that they do not take the name of Bishops without restriction, but simply that of Bishops elect and confirmed, both when they subscribe themselves, and in the citations sent them.

5. But there is something stronger yet than this. ^{Consecrates others.} There other alterations are, in the Appendix; nor was there so much as a hint given of this in the first Edition, which was occasioned by some mistake or another. D. W. [The clause omitted is the following: "and moreover, as we have seen, the Act of Investiture bears date April 26, 1536." Ed.]
^y Vindiciæ Eccl. Angl. p. 368.
^z [Instead of "consecrated—is not to be doubted of" the French has "certainly consecrated—proves it." With

Mr. Williams's last note, however, before me, I have felt bound to print the sentence as he gives it. Ed.]

^a Collier's Eccl. History of Great Britain, vol. 2. p. 126, 127.

^b [+ See the [Preface to the] Institution of a Christen Man.] [Reprinted in "Formularies of Faith put forth by authority during the reign of Henry VIII: Oxford 1825." p. 21 —: see p. 27. Ed.]

^c See the Proofs: [Art. IX.]

CHAP.
III.

is a Record in Cranmer's Register of the Consecration of Arthur Bulkeley as Bishop of Bangor. This ceremony was performed the nineteenth of February 154½^d, namely, in the reign of Henry the Eighth, under whom the ancient Ecclesiastical rules for the Consecration of Bishops were still exactly observed, and after the law renewed by this same Prince in the twenty-fifth year of his reign, ordering that Bishops should be consecrated at the least by three Bishops. "e He ordained," says Sanders, "that no one elected a Bishop should seek Pontifical bulls, or the Apostolic Mandate concerning Consecration, but only exhibit the King's Diploma; in pursuance of which being ordained by three Bishops, with the consent of the Metropolitan, he was ordered by an Act of Parliament, made in imitation of the ancient Canons, to be a true Bishop; nor was any one otherwise ordained to be acknowledged as such." It was undoubtedly well understood that the three consecrating Bishops must themselves have been consecrated; since, as Sanders remarks, Henry the Eighth in this only renewed the ancient Canons of the Church: *ad imitationem antiquorum canonum*.

But by the Canterbury Register, it is certain that in 154½^d, Barlow was one of the Consecrators of Bulkeley, who, according to Cranmer's Commission^f, was consecrated by John Bishop of Salisbury, William Barlow Bishop of St. David's, and John Bishop of Gloucester^g. Would a Bishop not consecrated have been suffered in those times to officiate at such a solemnity, and even to take precedence of the Bishop of Gloucester, who had been consecrated four months before^h?

6. It is further proved by Parker's Register, that at the very first Ordination performed by that Prelate, viz. on the twenty-first of December 1559, Barlow was one of the Consecrators. But if he had not been consecrated, why was he not consecrated together with the rest? And can there be any

^d Fasti Eccl. Angl. p. 27.

^e Decrevit ne quisquam electus in Episcopum Bullas Pontificias seu mandatum Apostolicum de consecratione requireret, sed Regium tantum diploma adferret, secundum quod a tribus Episcopis cum consensu Metropolitanæ ordinatus, jubebatur lege comitorum, facta ad imitationem antiquorum canonum,

esse verus Episcopus; nec alio modo ordinatum pro Episcopo agnosci oportere. *Sanderus de Schismate Anglicano*, lib. 3. p. 348.

^f This Commission [† or Mandate] will be found in a letter of which some extracts are given among the Proofs.

^g Memorials of Cranmer, p. 95.

^h Fasti Eccl. Angl. p. 101.

other reason assigned for this difference, but that given by the author of Parker's Life? "Scory and Barlow," says heⁱ, "being Bishops before, needed no Consecration, but were confirmed in their new Bishoprics the day before, being St. Thomas' Eve."

7. A fresh proof of Barlow's Consecration may be drawn from an Instrument which is found in the Canterbury Registers. Ground of vacancy.
 In 1554, when Queen Mary had ascended the Throne, some Protestant Bishops, apprehensive of persecution, left England, and went over into foreign countries. If Barlow had not been consecrated, doubtless the See would have been declared vacant, *ob nullitatem Consecrationis ejus*, [by reason of the nullity of his Consecration,] as is said of Taylor Bishop of Lincoln^k. Nevertheless, in the Commission drawn up by the Chapter of Canterbury for the government of the Church of Bath, during the vacancy of the See, it is said to be vacant, *per liberam et spontaneam resignationem Domini Willielmi Barlowe, ultimi Episcopi et Pastoris ejusdem*^l; [† by the free and voluntary resignation of W. Barlow, the last Bishop and Pastor of that Church.] This same clause is found in the *congé d'élire* directed to the Chapter of Bath by Queen Mary, dated the thirteenth of March 1554: *Per liberam et spontaneam resignationem in manus nostras ultimi Episcopi ibidem*^m; and in the Act of Investiture granted his successor. But this has never been said of any but consecrated Bishops.

It is true that in the Mandate to confirm and consecrate his successor Bourne, it is stated that the See was vacant, *per deprivationem et amotionem ultimi Episcopi ibidem*ⁿ, [† by the deprivation and removal of the last Bishop of that See.] But it is evident that these terms are here used^o only, because, in order to take from him all hopes of being restored, he was condemned by a sentence to lose this Bishopric, which he had first resigned, and of which it would have been useless to deprive him by a sentence, had it been known that he had not been consecrated. In fact, what proves that the See was really vacant by resignation, and not for want of Consecration, is, that in the Instrument of Investiture given to his

ⁱ The Life of M. Parker, p. 65.

^k Ant. Harmer, p. 133.

^l Ibid. p. 135.

^m Rymer, vol. 15. p. 369.

ⁿ [Ibid. p. 376.]

^o See the letters printed among the Proofs.

CHAP.
III.

successor, and subsequent by more than a month to the sentence supposed to have been passed, it is again said that the See was vacant by Barlow's resignation, *per liberam resignationem ultimi Episcopi ibidem*^p. Also that in the Register of the Chapter of Canterbury, the See is declared vacant by the resignation thereof which Barlow was obliged to make, on account of his being married: *Bathon. et Well. vacavit per resignationem Wmi Barlowe conjugati, cui successit Gilbertus Bourne*. All these facts are given among the Proofs, and from them arises an argument which may be regarded as a demonstration. For since the vacancy by resignation supposes the resigning Bishop consecrated, and since the deposition is attributed to his marriage, and not to want of Consecration, it follows evidently that the Records which prove the resignation or deposition of Barlow, prove evidently his Consecration. But such are the facts given, and the proofs thereof are still in existence. There is, then, no room to doubt of the Consecration of Barlow.

Negative
proof.

8. Finally, a last proof of this Consecration, but which is of no less force than the rest, though only a negative one, is drawn from the silence which was kept on this subject at the time when Barlow was accused of heresy, for having denied the necessity of Ordination. And in fact, is there one author found who, during more than seventy years, accused him of usurping the Episcopate without Consecration? Was it ever objected to him during an Episcopate of more than thirty years, that he had exercised the functions of a Bishop without possessing the sacramental stamp of Consecration? Have not both Catholics and Protestants acknowledged him a true Bishop? and is he not supposed really consecrated in the sentence for depriving him? In a word, is there the least admission, or the least authentic testimony of those times, to support an accusation which is founded only on the want of a Record, whose loss may be ascribed to an infinity of causes, and is no prejudice to any other Consecration than Barlow's, although common to many other Bishops together with him? Let who will believe it, but the omission of reproaches and accusations in such a case, is infinitely more in favour of Barlow's Consecration than the loss of such a

^p [Rymer, vol. 15. p. 384.]

Record can be hurtful. But even though all these proofs taken separately should not appear so convincing as they really are, the putting them together forms a presumption so strong in favour of the Consecration of Barlow, that they ought to pass for a demonstration, and the loss of the Record not be allowed in any manner to prejudice it.

CHAP. IV.

ANSWER TO THE REASONS ON THE OTHER SIDE. THE PUBLIC INSTRUMENTS [See p. 58.]
PROVE NOTHING AGAINST BARLOW'S CONSECRATION.

THE first reason insisted upon is drawn from the impossibility of finding the Record of his Consecration. This has already been answered beforehand, by producing several Instruments which abundantly supply the loss of that one. For a negative argument has weight only so far as nothing is brought to supply the want of the testimonials judged necessary. But the Record in question is here supplied in different ways. 1. By the positive testimonies of Godwin, Wharton, and some others. 2. By acts which, according to the usage and government of the Church of England, all suppose Consecration; such is the Investiture, the seat in Parliament, the Consecration of other Bishops, and different Episcopal functions, of which we have given the proofs. 3. By a silence on the other side, which tells more in favour of the Consecration than the other does against it; and this silence is proved by Barlow's having never been reproached with this want of Consecration either on the part of the Prince, or on that of his own Church, or even on that of the Catholics; and because when the old Bishops refused to acknowledge the new ones, they did not allege the want of Consecration in Barlow, but only the defectiveness of the new Form, and the non-observation of the laws of the Realm in these first Ordinations. Barlow's Consecration, then, passed for certain, and was contested by no one at the time, however decisive this argument against the new Bishops would have been, had it been supported by the least shadow of truth. 4. By the acknowledgment even of his enemies, who owned him a Bishop, who treated him as a brother, who accepted

First objection.

Record supplied.

CHAP. his resignation, and who in the sentences of deprivation gave
 IV. — him the title of *ultimus illius sedis Episcopus*, the last Bishop
 of that See; which they would never have done if he had
 not been consecrated. 5. Lastly, by examples of similar
 omissions which have never thrown doubt on the Ordination
 of those whose Record of Consecration either has not been
 entered in the Register, or has not been found. Why then
 doubt any more of Barlow's Ordination than of that of the
 others?

From all this I conclude, that the loss of the Record of
 Barlow's Consecration cannot in the least prejudice it, because
 silence has weight only where no opposite Record is produced
 to destroy it. But in the present case, the silence is
 destroyed, or, to speak more properly, is supplied, by a
 number of Records that attest the Ordination. No conclu-
 sion, then, can be drawn against Barlow's Consecration from
 the want of its being registered.

Champney
 answered.

But, says Champney^a, all he did was without power, and
 simply as an Usufructuary, and all his functions prove nothing,
 because he might have performed the same without being a
 Bishop. To answer such reasons as these is almost useless.
 Even though I should produce the Record which is judged
 necessary, what would hinder such adversaries from accusing
 it of being supposititious? from maintaining that it has been
 forged since the time? from saying that the Registers have been
 falsified, and that nothing which comes from a suspected hand
 ought to be trusted? There is no demonstration in the case of
 historical facts which is proof against such obstinacy. When
 the genuineness of Instruments is denied, merely because it is
 one's interest that they should be false, there is an end of all
 disputation. This is the last resource of those who have no
 reasons to produce. They will have the Record of Parker's
 Consecration to be false, because it is necessary that it should
 be so to maintain their cause: even should we produce that of
 Barlow's, since they have the same interest, there is ground
 to believe it would meet with no better reception. But let
 the instrument be wanting or found, it is sufficient to prove
 his Consecration certain, that he could not have concealed or
 omitted it without exposing himself to the reproaches of the

^a De Vocatione Minist. p. 491.

public; and that, nevertheless, he always performed the functions of a Bishop without any one's having ever accused him of it, at the very time when they were most interested to dispute his Episcopate. Besides, how reconcile with the quality of a simple Usufructuary the *cong  d' lire*, the Letters Patent for his Confirmation, the order to consecrate him, the Acts of Investiture, the leasings and alienations, all functions annexed by the laws of the kingdom to the Episcopal character? Believe it who can; but, for myself, I do not see the least shadow of probability in it.

The second reason appears stronger: because the silence is supported by some documents, which seem to decide that Barlow had never been consecrated. The first is the Commission addressed to Matthew Parker in 1559, to install Barlow in the See of Chichester, in which Commission Queen Elizabeth orders him to be consecrated. ^b *Regina, &c. . . Rogantes . . . et mandantes quatenus eundem Magistrum Willielmum Barloo Episcopum et Pastorem Ecclesi  predict  consecrare, c teraque omnia et singula peragere . . . velitis.* The entire Instrument will be found in the Appendix, among the Proofs. Whence it is concluded, that if Barlow had been already consecrated in 1536, the Queen would not have given a Commission to Parker in 1559 to perform this Consecration.

This proof of Barlow's want of Consecration becomes so much the more pressing, because when the business was merely to translate Bishops already consecrated, Rymer's Collection furnishes us with a number of Instruments in which the Mandate empowers the Metropolitan, simply to confirm and invest, and not to consecrate. This appears by the Instruments of translation^c of Thirlby to the Bishopric of Ely, of Grindal to the Archbishopric of York, of Sandys to the Bishopric of London, of Barnes to the Bishopric of Carlisle, of Guest to the Bishopric of Salisbury, of Freaque to the Bishopric of Norwich, and of many others, which give merely a power to confirm, authorize, install, invest, *confirmare, auctorisare, intronizare, investire*, and reserve the term *consecrare* for those who were not as yet Bishops, as appears by the Mandates^d drawn up for Richard Davys,

Second
objection.

^b Rymer, vol. 15. p. 550.

699. 749.

^c Ibid. vol. 15. p. 404. 681. 683, 684.

^d Ibid. p. 551, 552, 555, 561, 589.

CHAP. Rowland Meyrick, Richard Cox, John Jewel, Henry Morgan^e,
 IV. — Nicholas Bullingham, William Alley, and a hundred more,
 whose Instruments are found in Rymer's copious Collec-
 tion.

This second reason appears alone decisive to Monsieur L'Abbé Renaudot, because he believes falsely that the facts on which it is founded are incontestable, and supposes without reason, that Barlow's Consecration really followed the Mandate directed to Parker, dated the eighteenth of December 1559, to consecrate him. This reason would, in reality, overwhelm the maintainers of Barlow's Consecration, if the exactness of this Instrument could be warranted; and if, too, the same Collection, which furnishes us with it, did not at the same time supply us wherewith to destroy it, and to demonstrate that the terms which cause the difficulty are but a matter of style, to which the secretaries have often paid no attention.

Without
force.

To prove this, there are two convincing means. The first, that in several Mandates directed to the Metropolitans, to confirm the translation of Bishops already consecrated, and to install them, the term *consecrare* is found, as if they had not been already consecrated. The second, that in other Mandates, drawn up for the Confirmation and Consecration of new Bishops, the term *consecrare* has been omitted, as if they had been consecrated already. This reason, therefore, which at first appeared decisive, falls of itself; and to destroy it utterly, we need only collect the facts dispersed through Rymer's Collection.

Consecrare
used need-
lessly.

In 1534, John Capon, or Salcot, was consecrated Bishop of Bangor, April the nineteenth, which is proved by Cranmer's Register^f. We even find there the names of the assistant Bishops, who were the Bishops of Lincoln and of Sidon. In 1539, this same Bishop was translated to Salisbury. All this was under Henry the Eighth, when they were in no mind to disallow the Ordinations performed by Cranmer since the Schism. Nevertheless, in the Mandate addressed to this Prelate, to confirm the translation of the Bishop of Bangor to Salisbury, it is directed that he should consecrate him, ^g*Firmiter vobis mandantes quatenus præfatum Johannem Capon*

^e [Read, Thomas Yonge. Henry p. 561. ED.]
 Morgan was his predecessor, deprived
 by Elizabeth. See Rymer, vol. 15.

^f Memorials of Cranmer, p. 30.
^g Rymer, vol. 14. p. 641.

Sarum electum, et electionem prædictam confirmare, et eundem Johannem Capon in Episcopum Sarum consecrare, prout moris est, cæteraque peragere &c.

In 1544, Nicholas Hethe Bishop of Rochester was removed to Worcester by Henry the Eighth. He had been consecrated the fourth of April 1540, by the Bishops of Winchester, Chichester, St. Asaph, and Hereford, by a Commission from Cranmer^h. Yet in the Letters addressed to that Prelate to confirm this Bishop in his new See, it is said that he is to be consecrated. ⁱ*Quocirca vobis mandamus quod cætera omnia quæ per vos ad Confirmationem et Consecrationem ejusdem in dicto Episcopatu fieri consueverunt . . . facere velitis.*

Henry Holbeche Bishop of Rochester^k had been consecrated the eighteenth of June 1544. He was translated to Lincoln in 1547. And yet, as if he had not been already consecrated, the mandate to Cranmer directs that he should perform all things requisite for the new Elect's Confirmation and Consecration. ^l*Ad Confirmationem et Consecrationem.*

In 1584, William Wickham was made Bishop of Lincoln^m, and consecrated the sixth of December the same year. He was translated to the See of Winchester in 1595. It was not now necessary to consecrate him, for that had been done already. Yet the mandate to Whitgift directs that Prelate to invest and consecrate him. ⁿ*Quatenus vos prædictum . . . electum, investire et consecrare . . . velitis.*

In 1595, Matthew Hutton Bishop of Durham was translated to the See of York. He had been consecrated Bishop of Durham on the twenty-seventh of July 1589^o. Nevertheless, in the mandate to Whitgift for his enthronization, he is ordered to confirm, invest, and consecrate him. ^p*Electionem prædictam confirmare, ac eundem Archiepiscopum et Pastorem Ecclesiæ prædictæ investire et consecrare.*

Hugh Bellot, or Billett, was consecrated Bishop of Bangor on the thirtieth of January 1585^q. He was translated to Chester in 1595. The Letters Patent for installing him are directed to the Archbishop of York, and, as if he had never

^h Memorials of Cranmer, p. 90.

ⁱ Rymer, vol. 15. p. 12.

^k Reg. Cranmer. and Fasti Eccl. Angl. p. 251.

^l Rymer, vol. 15. p. 153.

^m The Life of Whitgift, p. 215. and

Fasti Eccl. Angl. p. 142.

ⁿ Rymer, vol. 16. p. 269.

^o Fasti Eccl. Angl. p. 350.

^p Rymer, vol. 16. p. 270.

^q The Life of Whitgift, p. 245.

CHAP. had Consecration, they order that he should be consecrated.
 IV. ^r *Et eundem Hugonem Episcopum et Pastorem sedis prædictæ consecrare.*

This Bishop held the See only two years. Richard Vaughan, who had succeeded him in the See of Bangor, succeeded him again in that of Chester in 1597. He had been consecrated Bishop of Bangor the twenty-fifth of January 1596^s, and yet the Mandate to the Archbishop of York to confirm his translation, and to install him in this new See, directs him to be consecrated; ^t *Eundem Richardum Episcopum et Pastorem Ecclesiæ Cestrien. prædictæ consecrare.*

Lastly, not to multiply here a greater number of examples, John Thornborough was translated from Limerick to Bristol. He had been already consecrated. Yet the Commission to Whitgift directs, that he shall confirm and consecrate him; ^u *Confirmare et . . . consecrare.* But this Consecration was not performed, because, as the author of Whitgift's Life observes^x, he was already consecrated.

Omitted
when
wanted.

But if in the Mandates addressed by the Prince to the Metropolitans, the term *consecrare* is often found when unnecessary, often also has it been omitted when necessary, that is, when new Bishops who had never been consecrated were concerned. This same Collection of Rymer's furnishes us with many equally authentic proofs of this also.

In 1571, Thomas Cowper Dean of Christ Church, Oxford, was nominated to the Bishopric of Lincoln by Queen Elizabeth. He had not been consecrated before, and underwent the ceremony on the twenty-fourth of February of the same year^y. Yet in the Mandate to Parker, to confirm and consecrate the new Bishop, there is no mention of the Consecration. ^z *Mandantes quatenus vos—electionem illam confirmare, et eundem Episcopum et Pastorem Ecclesiæ prædictæ auctorizare, et investire, cæteraque omnia et singula peragere—velitis.*

William Bradbrige Dean of Salisbury, was the same year elected Bishop of Exeter, and according to Parker's Register^a, was consecrated on the eighteenth of March 157^q.

^r Rymer, vol. 16. p. 281.

^s The Life of Whitgift, p. 487.

^t Rymer, vol. 16. p. 317.

^u Ibid. p. 519.

^x The Life of Whitgift, p. 584.

^y The Life of Parker, p. 316.

^z Rymer, vol. 15. p. 690.

^a The Life of Parker, p. 316.

The Mandate for this Consecration is dated the twenty-sixth of the preceding February, and there is no more mention made in it of Consecration than if it had been already performed. There is mention, as in the preceding case, only of authorizing and investing: ^b *Auctorizare et investire*.

In 1573, William Hughes, Doctor in Divinity, was nominated to the Bishopric of St. Asaph, and was consecrated the thirteenth of December the same year ^c. Yet in the Mandate of the eleventh of December, directed to Parker for this Consecration, mention is made, as in the former cases, only of authorizing and investing, ^d *auctorisare et investire*.

In 1577, John May, Doctor in Divinity, was elected Bishop of Carlisle, and was consecrated the twenty-ninth of September ^e. Nevertheless, in the Mandate, dated the ninth of August preceding, and directed to Sandys Archbishop of York, the Consecration is not mentioned, or at least it can be so only very implicitly. ^f *Electionem prædictam confirmare, cæteraque omnia et singula peragere et perimplere &c.*

Toby Matthews was nominated to the Bishopric of Durham in 1595 ^g. He had not been consecrated before, being only, when he was appointed, simple Doctor of Divinity: yet, in the Mandate directed to Hutton Archbishop of York to consecrate him, there is no mention made of Consecration, but simply of Confirmation and Institution. ^h *Electionem prædictam confirmare, et eundem—Episcopum et Pastorem Ecclesie prædictæ instituere, cæteraque omnia et singula facere &c.*

More examples would be needless; and supposing the Instruments published by Rymer to be faithfully transcribed, these would be sufficient of themselves to shew that the term *consecrate*, found in the Mandate to install Barlow in the See of Chichester, would not prove that he had not been consecrated before. For, in short, the use or omission of this expression, can prove nothing against Barlow, if it has been used where it was needless, and omitted where it was wanted. But it is evident from the facts related, and all established by the most authentic Registers and Instruments, that this

^b Rymer, vol. 15. p. 690.

^c The Life of Parker, p. 459.

^d Rymer, vol. 15. p. 729.

^e Fasti Eccl. Angl. p. 335.

^f Rymer, vol. 15. p. 780.

^g Fasti Eccl. Angl. p. 350.

^h Rymer, vol. 16. p. 272.

CHAP.
IV.

expression has been thus used and omitted. This pretended demonstration, then, of M. L'Abbé Renaudot fails altogether, and cannot so much as give solidity to a conjecture, much less form a convincing proof.

The Com-
mission
miscopied.

But without stopping to ward off the force of this Instrument,—to make it favourable to me, I have only to restore it to its primitive purity; then, far from being obliged to defend Barlow's Ordination against it, the document itself will become a proof against those who would draw advantage from it against the Consecration of Barlow. For a recent author, who has lately consulted both Parker's Register and the Archives of the Tower¹, whence Rymer copied this Instrument, assures us, that he has made a mistake in transcribing it; that the term *consecrare* is not to be found either in the Register or in the Archives of the Tower, and that the error proceeds solely from Rymer, who has copied this Instrument incorrectly. I cannot forbear giving his own words, though a little long, because they are too important to be omitted. “^kBut to dwell no longer upon conjectures,” says this author, “I positively affirm, that in this case there was no error in the Royal Mandate: whatever fault there was, was all Rymer's; who inspecting at the same time seven mandates of altogether the same tenor, did not accurately enough observe that five of them required both; namely, that the Bishops nominated in them should be both confirmed and consecrated; that two (namely, those which related to Barlow and Scory) required only that they should be confirmed.”

The difference this author notices between these Instruments, evidently confirms the opinion generally received of Barlow's Consecration; and to establish the proof of this difference, he proceeds in these words: “^lI here appeal to

¹ [So the French. Mr. Williams has “the Records in the Chapel at the Rolls.” Ed.]

^k Sed ne ex conjecturis diutius agam, fidenter assero nullum in Mandato Regio, hoc in casu, errorem fuisse: culpa quæcunque fuerit, tota fuit Rymeri, qui septem ejusdem prorsus tenoris Mandata simul inspiciens, non satis accurate observavit, eorum quinque utrumque exegisse, scilicet ut Episcopi in illis nominati et confirmarentur et consecrarentur: duo (ea scilicet quæ ad

Barlovium atque Scoræum pertinebant) id solum requisivisse ut confirmarentur. —*De Vera et non Interrupta Episc. Angl. Success. Epist.* p. 17.

^l Testes hic appello Acta publica, non solum Registrum Parkeri, in quo utrumque instrumentum fideliter inseritur, sed ipsum Rotulum, unde utrumque (licet erronee) exscripsit Rymerus. In utroque eorum quicquid de consecratione sive Barlovii sive Scoræi in Rymero legitur, omnino omittitur; nec aliud quidquam Archiepiscopo demandatur,

the public Records as witnesses; not only to Parker's Register, in which both Instruments are faithfully inserted, but to the very Roll itself, whence Rymer (though erroneously) transcribed it. In both these, whatever is found in Rymer of the Consecration either of Barlow or of Scory, is altogether omitted; nor is there any thing further required of the Archbishop, but that he should confirm them Bishops of Chichester and Hereford. For the sake of critics, I will faithfully transcribe the very words of the Royal Commission as inserted in the Roll and the Register. *Rogantes ac—mandantes, quatenus eundem Mag. Guil. Barlo in Episcopum et Pastorem Ecclesiæ Cathedralis Cicestrensis prædictæ (sicut præfertur) Electum, electionemque prædictam confirmare, cæteraque omnia peragere—velitis.* What the Queen commanded, the Archbishop performed: he confirmed both Barlow and Scory, but consecrated neither."

It is therefore building in the air, to rest the defect of Consecration in Barlow upon what is an error of the transcriber, disproved by an inspection of the Instrument itself, and by all the facts relating to it. For, to make this Mandate, such as it is given by Rymer^m, at least raise a suspicion that Barlow had not as yet been consecrated, it would be necessary to produce some proof of the Consecration of this Prelate by Parker, drawn either from Parker's own Register, or from some Instruments of equal authority. However, neither Parker's Register, nor the writer of his life, nor the author of the *Fasti Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ*, nor any one else that I know of, makes the least mention of it, while several declare positively the contrary.

Amongst others, a contemporary author, who has written on the Antiquitiesⁿ of the British Church, whom some believe to have been Parker himself, and whose work was published first at London in the year 1572, during Parker's life, speaks

Testimonies.

nisi ut eos in Episcopos Cicestrensem atque Herefordensem confirmaret. Verba ipsa Brevium Regiorum, prout in Rotulo atque Registro ponuntur, in Aristarchi gratiam fideliter apponam. *Rogantes ac—mandantes, quatenus eundem Mag. Will. Barlo in Episcopum et Pastorem Ecclesiæ Cathedralis Cicestrensis prædictæ (sicut præfertur) Electum, electionemque prædictam confirmare, cæteraque omnia peragere—velitis.* Quod

Regina mandavit, præstitit Archiepiscopus: confirmavit utrumque, Barlovium atque Scorum; neutrum consecravit. † *Ibid.* p. 18.

^m Vol. 15. p. 550.

ⁿ [Read, Antiquity. The title of the work is: "De Antiquitate Britannicæ Ecclesiæ et Privilegiis Ecclesiæ Cantuariensis, cum Archiepiscopis ejusdem LXX. Historia." Ed.]

CHAP. positively only of Barlow's Confirmation, and says nothing of
 IV. his Consecration. "°In the first year of his Consecration," says he, "he (Parker) consecrated eleven and confirmed two " Bishops of his Province at Lambeth. The Bishops that " were consecrated are these; Grindal, Cox, Sandys, Jewel, " Barkley, Bentham, Meyrick, Yong, Davis, Bullingham, " Guest. In the same year were confirmed, William Barlow, " who in the reign of Edward the Sixth was Bishop of Bath " and Wells, requested for Chichester, and John Scory " translated from Chichester, which he had held in the reign " of the said King Edward, to the See of Hereford." This Life of Parker, which was annexed to several copies of the edition of 1572, of the Antiquities of the British Church, and which Mr. Strype has had reprinted in the Appendix to his Life of this Prelate, is not found in the Hanau edition of 1605; but this cannot concern this fact, since there is preserved in this last Edition^p a Table of the Ordinations performed by Parker up to the year 1571, wherein it is set down, that he only confirmed Barlow and Scory.

Camden. Camden, a well-informed and almost contemporary writer, whom I have already quoted on the subject, says also, in positive terms, that Parker only confirmed Barlow. "°He " afterwards," says he, "consecrated Edmund Grindal. . . . " He also confirmed William Barlow, who in the reign " of Henry the Eighth had been Bishop of St. David's and " afterwards of Bath, in the Bishopric of Chichester, and " John Scory, a learned and judicious man, who had formerly " been Bishop of Chichester, in the See of Hereford." Godwin, the author of the *Fasti Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ*,^r and all the rest who have made mention of this translation, speak in

° Primo Consecrationis suæ anno, (Parkerus) Lamethi sacrauit undecim et confirmavit duos in sua Provincia Episcopos. Episcopi qui consecrati fuerunt sunt hi: Grindal, Cox, Sands, Juell, Bareley, Bentham, Mericke, Yong, David, Bullingham, Ghest. Eodem anno confirmati sunt Gulielmus Barloe, regnante Edwardo Rege Bathoniensis et Wellensis Episcopus, ad Episcopatum Cicestrensem postulatus, et Johannes Scorye a Cicestrensi Episcopatu, quem eodem Edwardo Rege gesserat, ad sedem Herefordensem. *Appendix to Strype's Life of Parker*, p.

153, 154.

^p Ed. Hanoviæ, p. 39. [Ed. Lond. 1729, p. 55.]

^q Ille postea consecravit Edmundum Grindallum,—Confirmavit autem Gulielmum Barlovum (qui regnante Henrico VIII. fuerat Menevensis, et postea Bathoniensis) in Cicestrensem, et Joannem Scorium, virum erudito judicio, qui prius fuerat Cicestrensis, in Herefordensem. *Camden. Annal. Eliz. p.* 38. [p. 49. *Ed. Hearn.*]

^r Godwin de Præsulibus Angliæ, p. 562. and *Fasti Eccl. Angl. p.* 58.

like manner only of Confirmation, and not at all of Consecration, any more than the late author of Parker's Life, who has faithfully followed testimonies so worthy of belief; and who assures us, as we have seen, that "Scory and Barlow being Bishops before, needed no Consecration, but were confirmed in their new Bishoprics the day before, being St. Thomas' Eve." And from all these testimonies united, I form this argument, to which Monsieur Renaudot could not have made any solid answer, since it is drawn from his own principles. That Consecration is chimerical of which no proof is found, of which no Record can be discovered, of which no mention is made, either in the public Registers, or in any Instruments equivalent to them, and which on the contrary is destroyed by opposite Instruments and testimonies. But such is the pretended Consecration of Barlow by Parker. The only difference between M. L'Abbé Renaudot's argument and mine is, that the silence has here so much the more weight, because there is nothing to supply its place, but, on the contrary, every thing to strengthen it: whereas the want of the Record of Barlow's Consecration by Cranmer is supplied by a number of Instruments and equivalent proofs. Thus all the monuments and testimonies of all the contemporary and following writers agree in certifying or supposing Barlow's Consecration in the year 1535, that is to say, when he was Bishop of St. Asaph; and we see scarcely any thing to raise in our minds a suspicion of the contrary; unless they will oppose to us two Instruments given by Rymer, which might perhaps be insisted on, in default of more satisfactory proofs. If Barlow, say they, was consecrated, it must have been in the month of April 1536, since, if there be any weight in the proofs alleged, we find facts which suppose his Consecration at that time; and if he was not then consecrated, there is no likelihood that he ever was. But by two Instruments found in Rymer's Collection, it plainly appears that Barlow was not as yet consecrated. These two Instruments are the *congé d'élire* of Robert Warton to the Bishopric of St. Asaph, dated the twenty-ninth of May 1536, and the Mandate directed to Cranmer to consecrate him, dated the

Result.

Objection.

^s Life of Parker, p. 63.

^t Vol. 14. p. 570. These two Instruments are given among the Proofs.

CHAP. twenty-fourth of June in the same year. In these two
 IV. Instruments the See is declared vacant, by the translation of William Barlow, *ultimi Episcopi ibidem Electi*: these are the words of the Instruments. But if Barlow, say they, had been consecrated in April 1536, it is certain they would not have given him the title of *Episcopi ibidem Electi*, it being without precedent in Instruments of this kind, that Bishops already consecrated should be called simply Elect. And in fact, among all the great number of Instruments of the translations of Bishops already consecrated which Rymer's Collection contains, no one is found conformable to these; and in vain, according to all appearances, should we seek one elsewhere.

Answer. I cannot but acknowledge, that the two Records which, speaking of the See of St. Asaph, style Barlow *Episcopi ibidem Electi*, are very singular; but we must not be astonished at it, since it is very rare to see a Bishop translated to another See, before he has been installed in the former, and in the space of 200 years England scarcely furnishes two or three examples of this kind. But be the case as it may, it is certain, nevertheless, that the term Bishop Elect does not necessarily imply the want of Consecration. In fact, Champney himself owns, that a Bishop, though consecrated, may yet retain the name of a Bishop Elect, until such time as he is installed, that is to say, until he has been put into full possession of all rights, spiritual and temporal, belonging to his Bishopric. "It cannot," says he, "be concluded from Parker's being called Archbishop Elect, that he was not then consecrated at all, but only that he was not enthroned in his See, as it is necessary to think of Barlow and Scory, who are only called Bishops Elect." Thomas Ward^x, although as much opposed as Champney, to the validity of the English Ordinations, makes the same acknowledgment. But it is certain that Barlow was never installed in the Bishopric of St. Asaph, but having been translated to the See of St. David's, before he was installed in the former, was never able to bear any other title than that of Bishop Elect of his first See. The true

^u Non potest ex eo, quod Parkerus dicatur Archiepiscopus electus, colligi, illum non fuisse tunc omnino sacratum, sed tantum non fuisse in sua Cathedra inthronizatum, ut de Scoreo et Barloo,

qui Episcopi tantum electi dicuntur, necesse est sentire. *De Vocatione Minist.* cap. 14. p. 506.

^x The Controv. of Ordination, p. 64.

reason, then, why in the two Instruments objected to us, he does not bear the title of Bishop of St. David's, but that of Bishop Elect of St. Asaph, although he had certainly been consecrated, is that the business being to give him a successor in this last See, and not in that of St. David's, and he having never been installed, he was obliged to take the name of Bishop of St. Asaph, where they were giving him a successor, and of that to bear the title of Bishop Elect, according to the usage of the kingdom, because he had not been installed in that See.

To put this reply out of doubt, it needs only to be confirmed by an example which is so much the more convincing, because it is drawn from a case altogether parallel with that of Barlow. In the year 1633, after the death of Godwin Bishop of Hereford, William Juxon had been chosen to succeed him in that See. Before he was consecrated and installed, he was translated to London. He was confirmed in this new See the twenty-third of October 1633, and consecrated the twenty-seventh. Augustine Lyndsell, Bishop of Peterborough, succeeded him in the See of Hereford the seventh of March following. The King consented to his Election the twenty-first of March 1633, and on the twenty-fourth he was confirmed by Archbishop Laud. Now in the Act as well of the Election as of the Confirmation of Lyndsell, Juxon, although consecrated and confirmed in the See of London, is all along styled Bishop Elect of Hereford, as persons may satisfy themselves by inspecting the Register of Laud; as well as by several Instruments of the same tenor with this: *⁊ Cum sedes Episcopalis Herefordensis, tam per mortem naturalem Francisci Godwin nuper Episcopi ibidem, ac per promotionem Reverendi in Christo Patris Willmi Juxon in Episcopum ibidem Electi ad Episcopatum Londoniensem, nuper vacaverit, &c.* Should we have any right to conclude from these words that Juxon was not at that time consecrated, when we have the Record of his Consecration, prior by four months? And if Juxon could be called Bishop Elect of Hereford four months after he had been consecrated and installed Bishop of London, how can the title of Bishop Elect of St. Asaph, given to Barlow, who, besides, in the Act of his translation to St. David's is always called absolutely^z

A parallel case.

^y Regist. Laud. f. 28. 6.

^z Reg. Cranmer. f. 205.

CHAP. *Episcopus Assavensis*, without the addition of the word
 IV. *Electus*, how, I say, can the title of Bishop Elect of St. Asaph, given to Barlow, prove that he was not consecrated two months before?

Further
 confir-
 mation.

It is therefore false that it is unprecedented for Bishops already consecrated to be styled Bishops Elect; and if there be no Instrument of this kind found in Rymer's great Collection, it is because such translations as these are very uncommon, because his Collection does not reach so far as the time of Juxon, and because notwithstanding its extensiveness, many Instruments have not failed to escape his researches. Moreover, although we do not find there any Instrument of this kind, it is nevertheless untrue that Bishops consecrated are never called there simply Bishops Elect, since in almost all the Acts of Investiture published by this author^a, the new Bishop after his Consecration is styled only *electi et confirmati*, and not *consecrati*; which proves to a demonstration, that the term *Electus* does not always imply a want of Consecration. We conclude then from all this, that the public Instruments prove nothing against Barlow's Consecration; and that the obscurity of a single Instrument, which moreover might rather make one doubt concerning his Election to a subsequent Bishopric, than of his Consecration, cannot prejudice so many others, which carry their own conviction with them, and are incapable of any different interpretation.

Objection. Before I finish this chapter, I must not omit an objection which is brought from the possibility of a collusion, which they suppose there was between Cranmer and Barlow, to conspire together to omit this ceremony. As these two Prelates were of very Presbyterian sentiments, and did not acknowledge the necessity of Consecration, nor the efficacy of the Sacrament of Orders, it is very possible, they say, on this supposition, that Cranmer, who knew Barlow's sentiments with respect to the inutility and inefficacy of Ordination, and his aversion to the ceremonies of the Pontifical, and who, moreover, was of the same opinion himself,—it is very possible that, in concert with Barlow, Cranmer may have omitted this

^a Rymer, vol. 14. p. 487. 527. 550. [552. 553 (twice). 561.] 573 [twice]. 580. [583. 601.] 642. [643. 644.] 650. [651. 656.] 716, &c. See the extracts of letters given among the Proofs.

ceremony as superstitious, and have given him letters of institution and installation, by means of which he was put in possession, and in consequence of this, enjoyed the title, held the rank, received the investiture and the honours, and performed the functions of a Bishop, and was translated from one Bishopric to another, without any one's taking exception against him, before the reign of Queen Mary, when he was obliged to retire. This supposition, which at first was but possible, becomes in the eyes of some very probable, by reason of the impossibility there has been of finding the record of his Consecration; and this probability, say they, once renders useless all the facts alleged, since without being consecrated he might have done all it is supposed he did do.

This conjecture is very ingenious, and has, in truth, all the force a conjecture can have; but after all it is but a conjecture against facts; and how favourable soever be the supposition which is made to support it, I do not find that the omission of Consecration is very possible. For, in short, if the affair in question was to have been acted between Cranmer and Barlow alone, the conjecture might have some appearance of probability; but ceremonies of this kind cannot take place in a clandestine manner. There were required at least three Bishops by the Statute of 1533. There were required certificates of Consecration, in order to obtain the Investiture. If the thing was unknown, would no one have protested? And if it was known, were they not bound to protest still more strongly? In a thing impossible to be concealed, would Cranmer and Barlow have exposed themselves for their entertainment to the penalties of a Præmunire? It was not above three years before, that the Bishops had been obliged, under the penalties annexed to that law, to be consecrated by three Bishops. Henry the Eighth was the more strict in having the new laws observed, because, notwithstanding his Puritanism, he was an enemy to innovators. Was it an easy thing to impose upon him in a matter which is always very public, and which other Bishops were interested to detect? Besides, supposing it could be concealed from the King, was it possible it could be concealed from his Church? And, is it possible that no one should have urged against him even

CHAP. the least suspicions, or at least that they should have been so
 IV. stifled, that none should have reached our time.

Further
 proof.

This consideration also supplies us with a strong argument in favour of Barlow's Consecration, which I have already touched upon in the preceding chapter. For, in the year 1537, he found in his own Church accusers who taxed him with heresy, and he was charged with having advanced, among other propositions, this following: ^b "If the King's Grace, being Supreme Head of the Church of England, did choose, denominate and elect any Layman, being learned, to be a Bishop, *That he, so chosen, without mention made of any Orders, should be as good a Bishop as he is, or the best in England.*" Now does not this proposition, be it never so heretical, prove evidently that he had been consecrated himself? Besides, if he had not been consecrated, would those same persons who accused him of advancing heresy for maintaining that Ordination was unnecessary, have omitted to reproach him with making himself pass for a Bishop, without ever having been consecrated? Yet we see no trace of any such reproach; and Gardiner, who afterwards caused him to be deposed, treats him without scruple as Bishop of St. David's, and calls him Brother, in a letter which he wrote to the Duke of Somerset ^c, which he certainly would not have done, if he had not known that he had been consecrated.

Barlow's
 practice.

I readily concede then, that Cranmer and Barlow were of the Presbyterian sentiments with respect to Episcopacy. Who can deny it, after having read their answers to the questions proposed to them on this subject. These opinions, however, did not hinder Cranmer from being consecrated himself and consecrating many others. They did not prevent Barlow from consecrating Parker, and assisting at the Consecration of Bulkeley, Grindal, Cox, Sandys, and some others. Why should they hinder him from being consecrated himself? He had an aversion, they say, to the ceremonies of the Pontifical. But a man who employs his ministry in performing a function contrary to his conscience, and which he might have avoided, would such a man have omitted one which he thought necessary to give him a rank in the Church, although he did not

^b Strype's Memorials, vol. 1. Appendix, p. 287. [p. 184. Ed. 1721.] and

Collier's Eccles. Hist. vol. 2. p. 135.
^c Fox's Martyrs, vol. 2. p. 715.

think it free from superstition? This is making Barlow at once a man of tender conscience, and a man destitute of all religion: it is running at once into two extremes. He had one,—which, however, he accommodated to the times, to the King, to his interests,—and all this by such views as we call prudence, economy, and management: let us say rather, weakness and art.

I know it is surprising, that we nowhere find the Record of his Consecration, while we meet with other Instruments of little consequence relating to Barlow, and some even which seem to contain matter contrary to his Consecration. But how many documents of consequence have been thus lost, whilst an infinity of others of no use are preserved? Rymer's Collection alone furnishes us with a very great number of examples; we might even adduce a variety of fit reasons to lessen the surprise produced by an accident which is neither rare nor singular. These, however, are things with respect to which we can only guess; for when one sees divers omissions of the same nature, it is very probable that one need not look for other reasons besides the negligence of the Secretary, or rather the loss of a part of the Registers. For, as a learned Englishman remarks to me in a letter, of which some extracts will be found in the Appendix, all the Commissions granted by the Chapter of Canterbury to empower the Bishops of that Province to be consecrated elsewhere than in the Metropolitan Church of Canterbury are lost from the year 1531 to the year 1541,—whether this happened by some accident, or whether it was that the Registers were involved in the destruction made by the orders of Edward and Mary, of all documents of which those Princes thought it right to destroy the memory.

Be the matter as it may, to give some colour to this pretended collusion, it would be necessary that the thing should be very secret; and this too is what they pretend, saying that the whole affair was managed between Cranmer and Barlow, who, by concert, took pains to conceal it. Yet the Instruments quoted above to support the conjecture by facts, would prove on the contrary, that the omission of Consecration was very public. Since therefore the conjecture is contrary to the facts, and that one set destroys what the other establishes, as has already been shewn, it does not appear that any foundation

Other documents lost.

Inconsistency.

CHAP. can be laid upon such a conjecture, and it ought to be regarded
IV. as demonstrated, that Barlow's Consecration is indisputable.

Third ob-
jection.

I proceed now to the last difficulty which M. L'Abbé Renaudot has raised against Barlow's Ordination, and which he draws from Bonner's threat of excommunication against the Bishop of Landaff. But as it is necessary to consider this at some length, it shall be the sole subject of the following chapter.

CHAP. V.

BONNER'S THREAT OF EXCOMMUNICATION IS CHIMERICAL; AND WERE IT REAL, IT WOULD PROVE NOTHING AGAINST BARLOW'S CONSECRATION.

Bonner's
threat.

It is not easy to see at first sight, what connection there can be between Barlow's Consecration, and a menace of excommunication sent by Bonner Bishop of London to Anthony Bishop of Landaff; and no small ingenuity can be needed, to conclude from the one to the other. This however is what M. L'Abbé Renaudot does, saying that Bonner having threatened Anthony Bishop of Landaff with excommunication, if he took part in the Ordination of Parker, he would not have failed to send the same menace to Barlow, as soon as he learnt that it was he who had undertaken to perform that function, if he had believed him to be a Bishop.

Neal's
story.

To understand this menace fully, it is necessary to remember what we have related in the second chapter, concerning Parker's Ordination, on the testimony of Champney. It has been seen there, that, according to his account, the Bishops nominated by Elizabeth met at a tavern in one of the streets of London, where the Bishop of Landaff was present according to invitation; that the new Bishops reckoned upon his ordaining them; that Bonner Bishop of London having learnt what was going on, sent and threatened the Bishop of Landaff with excommunication, if he proceeded to do it; and that he, terrified by this menace, retired, and refused to lay his hands upon them. "a Thither likewise, upon invitation,

^a Illuc etiam invitatus venit Landavensis Episcopus, multa senectute jam decrepitus, vir simplex et meticulosus. Ab ipso expectabant ordinationem novi candidati. Quod Bonerus Episcopus

Londinensis, in carcere religionis ergo constitutus, subolfaciens, minatus est Landavensi excommunicationem, si eos ordinaret: quo nuncio territus, et tactus etiam fortassis intrinsecus conscientiae

came the Bishop of Landaff, grown decrepid by reason of great age, a simple and timorous man. From him the new candidates expected Ordination. Which Bonner Bishop of London, then in prison on account of religion, getting scent of, threatened him of Landaff with excommunication if he ordained them; with which message being terrified, and perhaps also being inwardly touched with the stings of conscience, he drew back, and excusing himself on account of the infirmity of his eyes, refused to lay hands upon them." It is this account which furnishes the ground of this objection, for, as it has been observed, if Barlow had been a Bishop and acknowledged as such, why should not Bonner have threatened him with excommunication as well as the Bishop of Landaff?

But to give some weight to this reasoning, it would be necessary first to establish the truth of the fact itself, and afterwards to draw from it a necessary conclusion; whereas we see neither the one nor the other, since the fact is opposed by every principle of criticism which can destroy its probability, and even though it were certain, nothing could be concluded from it contrary to Barlow's Consecration. Answer.

I say, 1. that the fact, when judged of by all the laws of criticism, is false, which is a thing not difficult to be proved. For it has been sufficiently shewn at large in the second chapter, that the whole relation of Neal, upon which this fact rests, is a tissue of fables each more chimerical than that which went before it; that it is contradicted by all the public Instruments there are, and in particular by all the Royal Commissions issued for the Ordinations of the new Bishops; by the Record of Parker's Consecration; by the Registers of Canterbury and other Churches; and in short, by all the most authentic Registers and Instruments lodged in the Tower of London. Moreover, this relation appeared in so bad a light to M. Renaudot, that much as it was to his purpose to give it weight, in order to destroy Parker's Ordination, he did not think proper to insist upon it, contenting himself with saying that the Protestants defended themselves but poorly from the reproaches made to them at the time, or a few years afterwards; as if it had been true, that this reproach had in reality been

The story
false.

stimulis, ille pedem retulit, et oculorum infirmitatem causatus, manus eis inupo-

nere recusavit. *Champney de vocat. Minist. cap. 14. p. 497.*

CHAP. V. made to them at the very time of the Ordination, or that it was defending themselves but poorly, to employ for its refutation the very Instruments of the Ordination, drawn from the public Registers.

The threat altogether improbable.

But not to repeat here all that I have already urged to destroy the truth of this relation, it is certain that the particular fact of the menace of excommunication has itself no appearance of truth; nor is there any probability that it should hinder the Bishop of Landaff from engaging in this affair. For, in fact, who was it that is made to have threatened this excommunication? It was a Bishop whom the Bishop of Landaff himself, as well as the other Bishops, must have looked upon as deposed, and consequently as one that had no longer any jurisdiction: a Bishop, who, independently of his deposition, which, irregular as it was, was yet very real, had in fact no jurisdiction over the person to whom he makes this pretended menace: a Bishop, who at most had only the right to prevent the performance of such an Office against his will in a church within his own jurisdiction, while at the same time there are many churches in London belonging immediately to the Metropolitan, *Archiepiscopo soli subjiciuntur*^b, as is observed by the author of the Antiquities of the British Church, who sets down a list of them, and mentions in particular, that the church of St. Mary le Bow, where Parker was confirmed, and the neighbourhood of Cheapside, are in the jurisdiction of the Archbishop of Canterbury.

Besides, this threat of excommunication cannot subsist with the Record of Parker's Consecration: for, according to this Record, his Ordination was performed in the Palace of Lambeth. Now the Palace of Lambeth is in the sole jurisdiction of the Archbishop of Canterbury, as the same author observes: "The manner and custom of the Archbishops of Canterbury has been from ancient times, and is still, that in their own estates, in whatever part of England they may be, no Bishop besides themselves has any right, but all jurisdiction

^b De Antiq. Britan. Eccl. p. 33. [Ed. Han. (v. p. 78.): in Ed. Lond. 1729, p. 49.]

^c Mos et consuetudo Archiepiscoporum Cantuariensium ab antiquo fuit et est, ut in terris suis, ubicunque per

Angliam sint, nullus Episcoporum præter se jus aliquod habeat, sed humana simul et divina omnia, velut in propria diocesi, in sua dispositione consistent. *Ibid.*

divine and human is in their hands, as if in their own diocese." There was nothing then to be feared from Bonner Bishop of London, in whose diocese Lambeth is not even placed. For, as an Englishman of distinction wrote not long since to one of my friends, ^d"the palace of Lambeth is situated in the county of Surry, and consequently in the diocese of Winchester, and not in that of London; but it is not subject to the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Winchester. Every Palace wherein a Bishop resides out of his diocese, in what place soever situated, is of foreign jurisdiction, and is what we style in our law, *A Peculiar*: the Bishop of Ely has a Palace at London exempt from all jurisdiction of the Bishop of London, and he acts within the limits of that Palace as in his own diocese." The Archbishop of Canterbury does the same at Lambeth, where almost all the Bishops of England are consecrated, and that without ever thinking of asking leave of the Bishop of Winchester, from whose jurisdiction it is exempt. Of what use then would Bonner's threat have been? He had power neither over the Bishop of Landaff, nor over the place where the Ordination was to be performed. That censure therefore could not have hindered the performance of the Office: it would have been hurling a bolt utterly in vain, and without the least prospect of preventing the enterprise which Bonner is made to oppose.

This pretended menace agrees still less with itself. For, according to Champney, the new Bishops had not taken on themselves to choose a tavern to be ordained in, except because they did not fear there the excommunication wherewith they were threatened if the thing were performed in a church. ^e"When they had," says he, "no hope of bringing the Bishop of Landaff, from whom they both desired and expected to receive Consecration, to their churches, they chose such a place to perform it in, as he himself did not scruple to come to, and thence it came to pass that they met by appointment at the Nag's-head." To no purpose then do they make the message of excommunication to be sent to this tavern, when

^d Letter from Daniel Pulteney, Esq. dated the 27th of March 1721.

^e Cum nulla esset illis spes Episcopum Landavensem (à quo consecrationem recipere et cupiebant et expectabant) ad Ecclesias suas adducendi,

talem locum ad id efficiendum elegerunt, ad quem ipse accedere non hæsitarret, indeque factum est ut ad Caput Mauni ex condicto convenirent. *Champ. de Vocat. Minist.* p. 500, 501.

CHAP. they believed themselves sufficiently protected by avoiding to
 V. — perform their ceremony in a church.

If it be answered, that if those who were to be consecrated little feared the excommunication, the Bishop of Landaff might be afraid of it for himself; this is assuredly what it is impossible to prove. For though at the bottom, the Bishop of Landaff always remained inwardly attached to the Catholic Doctrine, (*Pontificiæ doctrinæ addictissimus*, says Godwin^f), would he much trouble himself about an excommunication which he must naturally expect when he took the Oath of Supremacy, and recognised, as he did, the Queen as the Head of the Church of England?

Kitchin.

In fine, I agree that though the Bishop of Landaff had been nominated in both the Queen's Commissions for one of Parker's Consecrators, he still refused, or rather endeavoured to elude, the performance of an office he did not like, especially because he saw that all the Catholic Bishops were resolved not to meddle with the business; but we do not see that the fear of excommunication was the cause of that refusal. Perhaps it would not be a groundless belief that this Prelate, who, according to Godwin was at bottom a Catholic, notwithstanding the contradictory parts he acted in the commotions that disturbed that Church, and who expected every day some new return, had no inclination to be concerned in an Ordination, wherein he believed all the ancient rules were violated, and wherein they would revive the Ordinal of Edward the Sixth, which was thrown aside in the reign of Queen Mary. Thus without refusing directly to assist at these Ordinations, he took advantage of the slightest pretences in order to excuse himself, and left to be performed by others what he thought hateful and unpleasant in such an office. This apparently is the whole mystery of the Bishop of Landaff's non-compliance; and his past as well as subsequent conduct furnishes abundant ground to adhere to this conjecture, since we see that he fluctuates without ceasing, now on this side, now on that, and the fear of excommunication never hindered him from attaching himself to the stronger party.

Reasoning
 unsound.

But, 2. let us suppose this menace of excommunication

^f De Præsulibus Angliæ, p. 641.

against the Bishop of Landaff as true as we have shewn it to be imaginary ; it could only be by a very false consequence that we could conclude thence, that because Bonner did not threaten Barlow as he did the other, therefore Barlow was never consecrated ; for, in short, their cases were quite different. ^eAnthony Bishop of Landaff, by his reconciliation with Rome in the reign of Queen Mary, had re-entered the Catholic Communion, and did not again openly separate himself from it. Bonner might therefore threaten him with excommunication if he took part in an Ordination which he regarded as sacrilegious. There might be some room for such a menace in the circumstances which we suppose. For whether Bonner acted in the name of the Pope, or whether as Bishop of London he was able to forbid, under pain of Ecclesiastical censures, the performance of Ordination in a place within his jurisdiction ; in both these cases there was some ground to believe, that the Bishop of Landaff, who had not again openly turned schismatic, might yield to the menaces he sent him, and regard the censures of the Church.

But to what purpose had such threatenings been against Barlow, who had so long since separated himself from the Church of Rome, who had never reconciled himself to her, whom she had excommunicated along with all the other adherents to the Schism, and whom, consequently, it was to no purpose to threaten anew with an excommunication for which he would scarcely have had a moment's regard, and which would not have hindered him from proceeding further? This difference between Barlow and the Bishop of Landaff is very evident ; and it is surprising that M. L'Abbé Renaudot either did not perceive it, or having done so, did not at the same time see that all his reasoning was built on a false foundation.

Besides, it does not appear that Bonner threatened with excommunication any of the other Bishops who were Parker's Consecrators together with Barlow. Neither Scory, nor Coverdale, nor Hodgskins, received any message of this kind from Bonner, who ought not to have spared them any more than the Bishop of Landaff, since it was the same thing to

^e Sanderus de Schism. Angl. lib. 2. p. 307.

CHAP.
V.

assist as to be the principal Consecrator. Since however Bonner did not threaten the other three, should we conclude rightly from this silence, that these three consecrating Bishops were never consecrated themselves, because the menace did not extend itself to them? Even supposing it could be said of Scory and Coverdale, because their Ordination was performed according to King Edward's Ordinal, the same reason would not hold good as to Hodgskins, who was consecrated in 1537, in the reign of Henry the Eighth, and consequently with all the requisite formalities, and all the ceremonies prescribed by the Roman Pontifical.

Inconsistency.

But what is more decisive in this matter is, that the excommunication is of no force except on the supposition of the truth of Champney's relation. But on this supposition the menace could not apply to Barlow. For according to that account, it was not Barlow, but Scory alone who performed this office. "h Being disappointed of a Consecrator," says Champney, "they were forced to take new measures, and had recourse to Scory an apostate Monk, who, in the time of Edward the Sixth, had intruded himself into the Episcopate, in order to be ordained by him. He, who together with his religious habit had put off all conscience, soon performed the business, using this ceremony. They all kneeling before him, putting the Bible on the head of each of them, he said, *Receive power to preach the word of God sincerely*; and thus they all rose up Bishops." We find here no other Bishop but Scory, nor is there any mention made of Barlow. The menace therefore which Bonner might have made to him would have been altogether useless, since according to the account, he had nothing to do with this Ordination, and consequently nothing can be concluded contrary to the Consecration of Barlow from a threat which, according to all the rules of judging, could not have been made.

Dilemma. Thus of two things we must choose one. Either Champ-

h Consecratorum tamen frustrati, novum coguntur querere consilium, et ad Scoreum apostatam monachum, (qui sub Edwardo sexto absque ulla consecratione, ut statim videbimus, Episcopatum invaserat), ut ab eo ordinarerentur, recurrunt. Iste, qui cum habitu religioso conscientiam omnium exuerat,

rem cito peregit, hac usus cæremonia. Illis omnibus ante ipsum genua flectentibus, unicuique illorum Biblia super caput imponens, dixit, *Accipite potestatem verbum Dei sincere predicandi*. Et sic surrexerunt omnes Episcopi. *Champney de vocatione Minist.* c. 14. p. 498.

ney's account is true, or it is false. If it is true, it does not follow thence, that because the Bishop of Landaff was threatened with excommunication, Barlow would have been threatened if he had been a true Bishop; for it was not he who was to act on the refusal of the Bishop of Landaff, but Scory alone, as the account sets forth. If on the contrary the relation is false and not to be maintained, as I have proved it is, what use can be made of a threat which has no reality, and which can have no more authority than the fabulous relation on which it rests?

Nothing then is more false, or of less force for destroying Barlow's Consecration, than the argument drawn from this threat of excommunication. Nothing is more false, because it rests on a fabulous relation which contradicts itself, and is destroyed by all the public and authentic Instruments we have. But at the same time nothing is more weak, since even if we suppose the threat against the Bishop of Landaff to be true, it is impossible to conclude any thing from it against the Consecration of Barlow, whether we agree with the relation, or hold to the Record of Parker's Ordination.

Conclu-
sion.

CHAP. VI.

THERE WAS NOTHING ESSENTIAL WANTING EITHER AS TO THE MATTER OR AS TO THE FORM IN THE CONSECRATION OF PARKER.

I HAVE already in the second chapter given an historical account of Parker's Ordination, and the Record itself shall be inserted among the documents which are to follow this treatise. I shall annex likewise the Form of Ordination taken from the Ritual of Edward the Sixth, in order that persons may be in a position to judge from the documents themselves of the truth of all that we shall advance in this chapter.

But before I enter on the subject, it will be necessary first to lay down certain maxims, which may serve as principles in the determination of this question. To judge with certainty, then, whether there was any essential defect in Parker's Consecration, it is absolutely necessary to enquire what is essential in Ordination, with regard both to the matter and the form; which we shall now do in a few words.

General
maxims.

CHAP.
VI.
Matter of
Ordina-
tion.

To begin with what relates to the matter of Ordination; this is a point which does not require any long discussion, since the learned work of Morinus on the Sacrament of Orders. For on the strength of the proofs he has produced, all learned divines agree with him, that imposition of hands is the only essential matter of this Sacrament. “^a So at length, being forced to it,” says this learned writer, speaking of the School-divines, “they have betaken themselves to imposition of hands, which alone all the Fathers, and all the ancient Rituals, both Greek and Latin, acknowledge.” And in fact, though the School-men of the late time have wished to have either the unction or the imposition of the book of the Gospels, or even the delivery, as they call it, of instruments suitable to the dignity conferred, (as Durandus^b Bishop of Mende thought,) to be looked upon as essential parts of the matter of this Sacrament, yet all these are opinions which are now regarded as unable to be maintained, as well because it is easy to shew that the use of these things has not been either perpetual or universal, as because the Scripture speaks of nothing but the imposition of hands alone.

Uction
and book.

But besides this silence of the Holy Scripture as to all these points, it is well known that the unction neither is nor ever was in use among the Greeks; that before the ninth century, we see scarcely any trace of the delivery of instruments in the Rituals published by Fathers Morinus, Mabillon, and Martene^c; and that with regard to the imposition of the book of the Gospels, though the use of it is both more ancient and more universal than that of the unction, or of the instruments, yet there is no mention made of it in the Rites of the Ordinations of the Syrians and Maronites, published by Morinus^d, nor in the eighth and ninth *Ordo Romanus* given us by Father Mabillon^e; and it appears from Alcuin and Amalarius, that the Church of Rome has not in fact always made use of this ceremony. “^f It is not found in any authority

^a Itaque tandem coacti ad manus impositionem confugerunt, quam solam agnoscunt Patres omnes, Ritualesque omnes antiqui, tam Græci quam Latini. *Morin. de Sacris Ecclesiæ Ordinationibus*, part. 3. Exercit. 2. cap. 1. § 2. p. 19.

^b Rationale, lib. 2. cap. ult.

^c Morin. de Sac. Ordin. part. 2. Ma-

billon, Museum Italicum, tom. 2. Martene de Antiquis Ecclesiæ Ritibus, tom. 2.

^d Morin. part. 2.

^e Mus. Ital. tom. 2.

^f Non reperitur in auctoritate veteri, neque nova, sed neque in Romana traditione. *Alcuin. de Divinis Officiis*. [In

either ancient or modern, nor even in the tradition of the Church of Rome.”

I do not stop here to enlarge on all these facts; I take them for granted; and if any one should be disposed to dispute them, I need only refer him to the Proofs produced in the learned work of Morinus, and the Collections of Mabillon and Martene. But supposing them true, it follows thence What is essential. necessarily that imposition of hands is the only essential matter of Episcopal Ordination; that all the other usages are merely ceremonies, proper either to represent the effects of this Sacrament, or to point out its obligations more distinctly; that consequently they may be omitted without affecting the substance of the Sacrament; that every Church may add to them, or retrench from them, according as she may think best for public instruction and edification, without any one's having cause to be scandalized thereby: “^g Nor are we scandalized,” says Fulbert, “when we hear that different usages, but one and the same faith, has ever existed in the Churches of Christ;” and that it is not by the use or omission of these ceremonies that we must judge of the validity or invalidity of Ordinations.

Whether the facts resulting from the testimonies produced Renaudot. by the authors above quoted, or any other reasons still more forcible, have made an impression on Monsieur L'Abbé Renaudot, he seems to agree with us in this point, since he does not think there was any essential defect in Parker's Ordination with regard to the matter, and confines himself altogether to the defects of the form, which he calls “unknown to the whole Church, and of which no trace is to be found in all the Pontificals of the Christian world.”

But to determine this question on solid grounds, we must Form of Ordination. examine wherein exactly consists the essence of this form, whether in a certain formula of words, as this: *Receive the Holy Ghost, &c.* or in some fixed and uniform prayers for all Churches; or, lastly, in prayers in general, such as every Church thinks fit to make choice of, and use together with

Bibliotheca Patrum &c. De-la-Bigniana, tom. 10. col. 271 B. Ed. Paris. 1654. sub tit. *Qualiter Episcopus ordinetur in Romana Ecclesia.*]

^g Neque in hoc scandalizamus, si au-

dimus diversam observationem, sed non diversam fidem in Christi semper Ecclesiis extitisse. *Fulbertus Carnotensis, Epist. 2.* [In eadem Bibliotheca, tom. 3. col. 439 C.]

CHAP. imposition of hands, which all agree is the matter of Ordination.
VI.

The words
Accipe &c.

How prevalent soever may have been the opinion of the Schoolmen, who have maintained that these words, *Receive the Holy Ghost, &c.* are the form of Ordination, it is difficult not to yield to the reasons which Morinus and Martene bring to refute it, and of which the most convincing are, that these words have never been in use among the Eastern Christians, and that the use of them in the Latin Church is of very recent date. “^h No ancient Latin Rituals (says Morinus) have these words in them; they appear nowhere: even in many of the more modern ones no mention is made of them. . . . Among the Latins it is scarce four hundred years since they began to be used; as for the Greeks and Syrians, they neither use them now nor ever did use them. By no means then can they be said to belong to the substance of Ordination.” Martene is of no different opinion on this subject from the learned Morinus. “ⁱ Those words,” says he, “*Receive the Holy Ghost*, which before the aforesaid Preface are uttered with imposition of hands by the Consecrator himself, in which the Schoolmen of later times place the form of Episcopal Ordination, were unknown to all antiquity; so much so, indeed, that they are scarcely found in any Pontifical that is four hundred years old.” These assertions are supported by all the proofs that can be desired in a case of this nature, since of all the Oriental and Latin Rituals published by Morinus, Mabillon, and Martene, there are not above two or three, and those modern enough, in which these words are contained. It is not then by the change made in this form of words that we must determine the validity or invalidity of the English Ordinations, the form itself never having been a part of Ordination for more than a thousand years.

Uniform
prayers.

It is equally easy to shew that the essence of the form of

^h Nulli Rituales Latini antiqui hæc habent verba, nusquam comparent; etiam in recentioribus multis nulla eorum mentio. . . . Apud Latinos cœpta sunt usurpari vix ab annis quadringentis. Apud Græcos autem et Syros, nec est nec unquam fuit illorum usus. Itaque nulla ratione dici possunt ad Ordinis substantiam pertinere. *Morin. de Sacra. Ordin.* part. 3. Exercit. 2. cap. 2. § 2. p. 22.

ⁱ Verba illa, *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum*, quæ ante prædictam Præfationem cum manus impositione ab ipso consecratore proferuntur, in quibus formam Episcopatus reponunt Scholastici recentiores, toti antiquitati ignota fuerunt; adeo ut vix in ullo Pontificali annos quadringentos attingente reperiantur. *De Ant. Eccl. Ritibus*, lib. 1. cap. 8. art. 10. p. 330. [tom. 2. p. 27. Ed. 1788.]

Ordination is not annexed to any fixed and uniform prayers for all Churches. The mere inspection of the ancient Pontificals, or of the Rituals of different Churches, demonstrates it^k. The prayers found in the Greek Rituals, are different from those which are seen in the Oriental and Latin ones. Even among the Latin ones, though there is more uniformity in them, we do not fail to observe differences enough to warrant the conclusion, that though all have aimed at the same end, yet every Church has had the liberty of deciding on the particular form of words she would use in preference to the rest; and we may say of Ordination in particular, what Fulbert of Chartres says of all the parts of the Liturgy in general. "In many particulars," says he, "Greece from Spain, and from them the Churches of Rome and France differ: but neither at this are we scandalized." There is, then, no proof to warrant an inference, that the prayer used in the Roman Pontifical is more essential than any other, provided it be the same in substance, that is to say, that it contain an invocation of the Holy Ghost to obtain for the Bishop Elect all the graces of which he has need in order to discharge worthily the duties of his Office, whatever other difference there be either in the choice or arrangement of the words, or in the words themselves.

It is, then, the invocation of the Holy Ghost in general upon the Bishop Elect which makes the form of Ordination, and which, together with the imposition of hands, which morally accompanies it, constitutes properly what we call the Sacrament of Ordination. This is a natural consequence from the foregoing propositions; for if the form of Ordination consists neither in these words, *Receive the Holy Ghost, &c.* nor in any fixed and uniform prayers for all Churches, (for they have varied with times and places,) nor in those forms of words which accompany either the unction or the other ceremonies, (for these, by reason of their novelty, cannot be looked upon as the matter,) there remains only prayer in general to which we can attach the notion of form; and this indeed is the opinion

Prayer in
general.

^k Morin. de Sacr. Ordin. part 2.

clesia; sed neque in hoc scandalizamus.

¹ In multis Græcia ab Hispania, ab illis Romana et Gallicana discrepat Ec-

Fulbert. Carnot. Ep. 2. [In Biblioth. Patr. &c. tom. 3. col. 439 C. (v. p. 95.)]

CHAP. VI. which all our most able modern divines adopt, maintaining positively that, excluding every thing else, the imposition of hands and prayer, make up the matter and form of Ordination, and that consequently nothing else belongs to the substance of this Sacrament.

Council of Trent. But it is now generally agreed, and the Council of Trent declares expressly, That the Church may alter what does not concern the substance of the Sacraments. ^m[The holy Synod] declares that the Church has always had the power of making such constitutions and alterations in the dispensation of the Sacraments, provided their substance was preserved, as she should judge, respect being had to the variety of circumstances, times, and places, to be most expedient for the advantage of the receivers, or for the reverence due to the Sacraments themselves." It is moreover a received principle among Divines, that in cases where the Faith itself, or the substance of the Sacraments, is not concerned, every particular Church may draw up its own Rites, Liturgy, and Prayers, as we shall shew in another chapter.

General statement. To prove, then, the Ordinations of the English Bishops valid, we have only to shew that there was no essential defect in Parker's Consecration, and that the alterations made in the Formulary of Ordination, do not affect its substance. This it is easy to shew by a line of argument which will demonstrate the truth of the proposition I have advanced, and is a necessary consequence of the observations which have just been made.

Matter and form. Imposition of hands and prayer in general, that is to say, the invocation of the Holy Ghost to obtain for the Bishop Elect the graces necessary for the worthy discharge of the functions of his Ministry, make up of themselves the matter and essential form of the Sacrament of Orders. This is proved by both the Greek and Latin Rituals and Pontificals which antiquity has preserved to us, and from the testimonies of the ancients, who further confirm what we find in the Liturgical remains which have been published. I shall not stop to transcribe these proofs here, because they are in every

^m Declarat [sancta synodus] hanc potestatem perpetuo in Ecclesia fuisse, ut in Sacramentorum dispensatione, salva illorum substantia, ea statueret vel mutaret, quæ suscipientium utilitati,

seu ipsorum Sacramentorum venerationi, pro rerum, temporum, et locorum varietate, magis expedire judicaverit. Sess. 21. De Commun. c. 2.

one's hands, and would serve only to swell this Treatise to no purpose. But the English, in their new Form of Ordination, have retained both imposition of hands and prayer. Nothing essential, then, either as to the matter or the form, was wanting in the Ordination of Parker.

As there is no difficulty with respect to the first proposition, ^{English Ordinal.} and all learned Divines now agree unanimously on this point, all that remains to be done, is satisfactorily to prove the second, and this proof must be taken from the new Ritual, and from the Laws which enjoin its use. This is the Ritual which was published in the reign of Edward the Sixth, and having been resumed under Queen Elizabeth, continued in use until Cromwell's time. Nor was it long before it was again resumed, for when King Charles the Second was restored it was re-established, with some alterations, of which we shall speak hereafter, and with these alterations was published in 1662. But in this Ritual, whether as it was published at first under Edward the Sixth, or as it was altered afterwards under Charles the Second, we find both imposition of hands and prayer, or the invocation of the Holy Ghost to obtain for the Bishop Elect all the graces needful for him. This may be proved by reading the Ritual itself, which will be found among the Proofs added at the end of this Treatise, and of which I shall here produce only some extracts.

As to imposition of hands, it is evidently prescribed by King Edward's Ritual; for the Rubric says expressly: "Then the Archbishop and Bishops present shall lay their hands upon the head of the elected Bishop, the Archbishop saying, *Take the Holy Ghost, &c.*" The Rubric of King Charles the Second's Ritual is almost the same, for it runs in these terms: "Then the Archbishop and Bishops present shall lay their hands upon the head of the elected Bishop kneeling before them upon his knees, the Archbishop saying, *Receive the Holy Ghost, &c.*" These terms are distinct, and out of the reach of any cavil. The Records that are preserved of the ^{Records.} English Consecrations, are a further confirmation of this proof, as we see therein the exact observance of this ceremony. Thus in the second volume of the History of the Reformationⁿ, we find in the Record of Parker's Consecration these ^{Parker.}

ⁿ Appendix, p. 364.

CHAP.
VI.

decisive words: "*Post orationes et suffragia quædam, juxta formam libri autoritate^o Parliamenti editi, apud Deum habitam, Cicestriensis, Herefordiensis, Suffraganeus Bedfordiensis, et Milo Coverdallus, manibus Archiepiscopo impositis: ACCIPE, inquit Anglicè, SPIRITUM SANCTUM, &c.*" ["After certain prayers and suffrages to God, according to the form prescribed in the book established by the authority of Parliament, the Bishops of Chichester and Hereford, the Suffragan Bishop of Bedford and Miles Coverdale, laying their hands upon the Archbishop say in English, *Take the Holy Ghost, &c.*"]

Omitted ceremonies.

It is true indeed that in this Record there is no mention made, either of unction, or of the delivery of the instruments or of the laying the book of the Gospels^p on the head or shoulders of the person consecrated; but as we have seen already, and learned men have fully proved, these things do not belong to the essence of Ordination, and have not been observed either in all times, or in all places. The simple imposition of the book of the Gospels, which is the most universal and the most ancient of the ceremonies which have been omitted, has even been retained in a manner at least equivalent in the new Ordinal; in which, after the imposition of hands, we find this Rubric, "Then the Archbishop shall deliver him the Bible, saying, *Give heed unto reading, &c.*" And since this ceremony is no part of the matter and belongs not to the essence, of the Sacrament, it seems very indifferent whether it is on the head or the shoulders, or into the hands, that the book of the Gospels is put, especially since the ceremony is merely figurative, and has been differently practised in different Churches, as Morinus has observed, who concludes that it cannot be a part of the matter of Ordination. "This variety," says that learned writer "shews us as in a glass, how weak and frail are those arguments on the strength of which the generality assert or deny the imposition of the book of the Gospels to belong to the matter of Episcopal Ordination." This he had already proved by

^o [See the Editor's notes.]

^p In the first Ordinal of Edward VI.

"Then the Archebishop shall laye the Bible upon his Necke, sayyng, *Geve hede unto readyng, &c.*" [N.B. this note is not in the French Edition. Ed.]

^q Hæc varietas velut in speculo de-

monstrat quam caduca sint et fragilia argumenta quibus plerique freti assurrunt vel negant, codicis Evangelici in positionem ad Episcopatus materia pertinere. *De Sac. Ordin.* part exercit. 2. cap. 1. § 9. p. 21, 22.

reasons drawn from tradition. “^rRelying however on other reasons, reasons derived from Ecclesiastical tradition, I conclude that this imposition of the Gospels on the neck and shoulders of the person to be ordained, does not belong to the substance of Episcopal Ordination.” These reasons indeed have appeared so convincing to the learned world, that there has scarce been any dispute in the Schools upon this subject, since the publishing of his work.

This appears so certain and clear, that it is not at this point that M. L’Abbé Renaudot attacks the validity of the English Ordinations; he rests entirely on the alteration made in the form. This then must be examined, and I think I shall be able to prove clearly, that the changes therein made do not alter its substance. M. L’Abbé Renaudot teaches us positively the contrary, and maintains that “a form unknown to the whole Latin Church, ancient and modern, (and) of which no vestige is found in the Pontificals of all Christian nations, cannot be looked upon as valid”; and that the more because “this form suits as well the Ordination of Priests as that of Bishops”.

But I would willingly ask of that writer, what he means by “a form unknown to the whole Church”? For if by ‘an unknown form’, he means a Formulary of Ordination in which neither prayer nor invocation of the Holy Ghost upon the Bishop Elect is found, I agree with him that such a form is invalid, because the substance of such a form is quite altered and corrupted: but in this sense it is not true that the form of the English Ordinations is unknown to the whole Church, since both the one and the other are contained in it. If, on the contrary, by “an unknown form”, he means only a form of prayer differing from the Roman Pontifical, but which yet contains the same substance; it is true, in this case, that the form of the English Ordinations is unknown to the Latin Church; but withal there is nothing more false than that a form unknown in this sense, is on that account invalid.

For, to support such an assertion, it would be necessary to take for granted what has already been refuted, namely, that the form of Ordination is annexed to certain fixed and uniform

^r Aliis tamen rationibus fretus, ex traditione scilicet Ecclesiastica petitis, colligo illam Evangelii super cervicem et scapulas Ordinandi impositionem ad Episcopatus substantiam non pertinere. Ib. § 5. p. 20.

CHAP.
VI.

Eastern
Rituals.

prayers for all Churches. But this is evidently false, and is refuted by the bare reading of the ancient Pontificals of different Churches, and by comparing (which is easily done) the Greek and Oriental Rituals with those of the Latins. In fact, on this supposition, how can we maintain the validity of the Greek and Oriental Ordinations, their formulæ being quite different from ours? Or if those of the Greeks are good, how can we maintain the validity of those of the Latins? For if it be true that the validity of Ordination is annexed to a fixed form and an uniform prayer, either the Greeks or the Latins must necessarily want a true and valid Ordination. But in this case, by what right shall we assign the preference to one Church before the other, and what proofs have we that the prayers of the Latin Church, for instance, are the true form of Ordination, rather than those which the Greeks and Eastern Christians use?

English
case the
same.

This reason is so decisive, that nobody now disputes the validity of the Ordinations of the Greeks. And yet, if their Ordinations are valid, though the prayer they use is quite different from that of the Latins, how can we deny the Church of England the power to make for herself a particular Form of Prayers of her own, when we allow this right to the Churches of the East? Is it on account of the independence which the East affects with regard to the Church of Rome? But this independence, which Rome regards as criminal, cannot give right to that to which there is no other title. Can it be because the Church of England long since adopted the usage and Form of Service made use of by the Church of Rome? But if the English submitted freely to the use of the Roman Pontifical, there is no prescription against the liberty they retain of making therein the alterations they think necessary for the discipline of their Church; and if they had once the liberty of receiving it, they have still that of rejecting or reforming it. But we shall see below that it was with entire liberty that England submitted to the particular Ritual of the Church of Rome, and that Rome has no right to oblige other Churches to submit to her particular discipline, as St. Gregory the Great acknowledges with regard to the Church of England in particular. Can it be, lastly, that the Order of Service which the English have substituted for that

No pre-
scription.

English
Service.

of the Roman Pontifical, does not contain what is essential to the form of Ordination? But by comparing the prayers and formulæ of the Roman Pontifical and King Edward's Ritual, one may easily satisfy one's self that the Ordinal of the Church of England does not at all alter the substance of the true form of Ordination.

The essence of this prayer, as we have already observed, Prayers. consists in the invocation of the Holy Ghost, to obtain for the Bishop Elect all the graces of which he has need for the due discharge of his Ministry. But the full meaning of this prayer is preserved in the English Ritual; for it begins as follows: *Almighty God, giver of all good things, which by Thy Holy Spirit hast appointed diverse Orders of Ministers in Thy Church; Mercifully behold this Thy servant, now called to the Work and Ministry of a Bishop; and replenish him so with the truth of Thy doctrine, and innocency of life, that both by word and deed he may faithfully serve Thee in this Office, &c.* What more is asked in the prayers of the Pontifical? They enlarge indeed a little more on the duties of the Bishop; they mention the power of the Keys, and the authority committed to him, and speak of the unction and of the ornaments with which he is invested, in order to draw thence instructions suitable for him. But as the unction, and the greater part of the Episcopal ornaments have been laid aside, because in reality they are not essential to Ordination, it is not surprising that they should have omitted this latter part of the great prayer which is said as the Preface in the Pontifical: but as for what relates to the power of the Keys, and the authority committed to the Bishop, they have been far from forgetting it in the English Ritual. So in the prayer immediately preceding the imposition of hands, we read these words, *Grant, we beseech Thee, to this Thy servant such grace, that he may evermore be ready to spread abroad Thy Gospel and glad tidings of reconciliation to God, and to use the authority given unto him, not to destroy, but to save; not to hurt, but to help: &c.* These words are plainly agreeable to those of the Pontifical, where we read: *Da ei, Domine, claves regni cælorum, ut utatur, non gloriatur, potestate quam tribuis in ædificationem, non in destructionem.* [“Give [In the Preface, after the Unction.]

him, O Lord, the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, that he may make use of, not glory in, the power which Thou givest

CHAP.
VI.

for edification, not for destruction.”]; and to the question which is put to the Bishop Elect, in the new Ritual, whether he will suppress disorders, and exert the authority given him by the Word of God: *Will you—such as be unquiet, disobedient, and criminous within your Diocese, correct and punish, according to such authority as ye have by God’s Word, and as to you shall be committed by the Ordinance of this Realm?* which must necessarily be understood of the power of the Keys, which comprehends all the authority which the Church intrusts in the hands of the Bishop for the edification of the faithful.

Second in-
vocation.

So far it will be difficult to point out any defect in the form of the Ordination prescribed by King Edward’s Formulary. But there is more. After singing the Litany, in the Roman Pontifical, the consecrating Bishops lay their hands on the head of the Bishop Elect, saying these words, *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum*. This very formula, which may be considered as a second invocation of the Holy Ghost, although pronounced in an imperative manner, is used in King Edward’s Ritual, as in the Roman Pontifical: for after the hymn *Veni Creator*, and the prayer which follows it, the consecrating Bishops lay their hands on the head of the new Bishop, and the Archbishop says these words, *Take the Holy Ghost, and remember &c.* The thing done is exactly the same on both sides; and if it be granted that the omission of the prayers appointed to be used at the unction, or at the delivery of the instruments, does not affect the substance of the Ordination, as it appears proved, I see no longer any defect that can be found in the formula prescribed by King Edward’s Ritual.

Conclu-
sion.

For of these three things one must be true. The essence of Ordination is annexed either to the substance of the prayers which accompany the imposition of hands, or to the identical words of the Roman Pontifical, or lastly, to the other prayers that are used with the ceremonies of unction and of the instruments. It cannot be annexed to these last, because the ceremonies not being essential, the prayers which accompany them cannot be of a different nature. No more can it be annexed to the identical words of the Roman Pontifical, which are not followed in the East, and have varied even at Rome. More could not be said, if these words had been determined by Scripture; whereas not only is the Scrip-

ture entirely silent on this head, but further we have for it neither Canons of Œcumenical Councils, nor the perpetual and invariable practice of Churches. It is then only the substance of the form that we are to seek in this, as in the other Sacraments, where this has not been determined; and it cannot be denied that King Edward's Ritual has retained this substance, as may be seen by the quotations made from the prayers prescribed thereby.

CHAP. VII.

CONTINUATION OF THE SAME SUBJECT. ANSWER TO THE DIFFICULTIES.

THE ALTERATIONS MADE BY CHARLES THE SECOND IN THE RITUAL OF EDWARD THE SIXTH DO NOT PROVE THERE WAS ANY ESSENTIAL DEFECT IN THE ORDINATION OF PARKER.

I THINK I have proved very evidently in the foregoing Summing
up. chapter, that there was no essential defect in Parker's Ordination. The whole point indeed turns upon the plainest argument in nature. Imposition of hands and the prayer which accompanies it are the only matter and form of Ordination: this Morinus has demonstrated. But the Ritual of Edward, which was used at Parker's Consecration, has retained both the imposition of hands, and the substance of the prayers used with it in the Roman Pontifical. This is proved by the Record of Parker's Ordination, and by reading the prayers prescribed in that Ritual. His Ordination then must be accounted valid, and we see no way by which to destroy it. But as there is nothing so clear in matter of fact, but that it may be made obscure by different circumstances, which serve to vary, or even alter things entirely, it will not be improper to examine carefully what can be urged in opposition to the simplest and most natural proof in the world; and this we shall do in the present and the following chapters.

One of the first difficulties, and that not the least considerable, is the one M. L'Abbé Renaudot proposes, namely, that Renaudot's ob-
jection. the Form made use of for Parker's Ordination is a very equivocal one, suiting as well the Ordination of Priests as that of Bishops, since the words, *Take the Holy Ghost*, are equally suitable to both. That form, in fact, if we may believe this author, appeared so defective to the Bishops who had the care of revising the Ritual in King Charles the Second's time,

CHAP.
VII.

that, in order to determine it to the Priesthood or to the Episcopate, they thought it absolutely necessary to add some new words to the old, and that after these, "Receive^a the Holy Ghost," they added for the Priests, "for the Office and Work of a Priest in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the Imposition of our hands"; and for the Bishops, "for the Office and Work of a Bishop in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the Imposition of our hands; In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen." This addition is not to be disputed; and though it be not sufficient to establish the validity of the English Ordinations, it is, say they, more than sufficient to attest the invalidity of the form that was used in the Consecration of Parker, a form being reckoned invalid when it cannot determine the matter. But an indeterminate form is incapable of determining the matter, and such was the form made use of in Parker's Ordination. His Ordination therefore cannot be defended, and is faulty in one of its most essential parts. Such is the substance of M. L'Abbé Renaudot's argument, which I have a little expanded, in order to give it all the force of which it is capable.

Answer.

The fact
false.

But whatever force be given it, it cannot be made a solid argument, because it is false in fact, and supposes a principle which is still more false. I say, 1. That it is false in fact; for in King Edward the Sixth's Ritual, which was used till King Charles the Second's time, the formula *Receive* (or *Take*) *the Holy Ghost*, is determined otherwise for the Ordination of Priests, than for that of Bishops. For, besides that the prayers for the two Ordinations are different, the very formula in question is not alike. That for the Ordination of Bishops runs in these words: *Take the Holy Ghost, and remember that thou stir up the grace of God which is in thee by Imposition of hands: for God hath not given us the spirit of fear, but of power, and love, and of soberness.* That for Priests is as follows: *Receive the Holy Ghost: whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven; and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained. And be thou a faithful Dispenser of the Word of God, and of His holy Sacraments; In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.*

^a [So the Ritual of Charles the Second: that of Edward the Sixth had *Receive* for Priests, but *Take* for Bishops.

In our author's own work (the reader will bear in mind) these quotations are given in the Latin translation. ED.]

It is clear that these two forms of words are quite different, and relate to different functions. It is true there is nothing in them to mark that the one is for the Episcopate, and the other for the Priesthood,—and that in the revision of the Ordinal which took place under Charles the Second, they made therein the additions which have been mentioned: but it is evident that these additions were not made from necessity, but only for a fuller explanation; and that the formulæ in question, were sufficiently determined by the preceding prayers. Real case.

This is fully proved by two reasons; the first of which is, that they could not look upon this addition as necessary, without declaring null all the Ordinations made antecedently to the addition of this clause, and without the Bishops, who caused it to be inserted in the Ordinal, regarding themselves as wrongly ordained. But this was never thought of by any one, much less by the Bishops who were the authors of this addition: a proof that they considered it as a mere explanation. The second reason is, that the addition in question is unprecedented, and that no trace of it is found in the ancient Pontificals, or even in those which are now in use in the Church of Rome. How then can the validity of Ordination be made to depend on a clause which never was in use in any Church; which was neither prescribed nor even recommended by the English Ritual before King Charles the Second; and without which the formula is sufficiently determined?

But besides this falsity in point of fact, which overthrows the objection at once, it is also founded on the supposition of a principle whose falseness would of itself destroy all its force, even though the fact were true. This principle is, that the validity of Ordination depends on the particular formula *Receive the Holy Ghost*, and that even the validity of this formula depends on other words added to determine it; both of which are equally false and indefensible in sound divinity. The principle also false.

The first, because, as has been observed in the preceding chapter, the validity of Ordination cannot be made to depend on a formula which has never been used in the Eastern Churches, and of which no mention was made in the Latin Church for more than a thousand years. But such is the formula, *Receive the* First part.

CHAP. *Holy Ghost.* Morinus acknowledges it expressly. “^bAmongst
 VII. the Latins,” says he, “these words began to be used scarcely
 four hundred years ago: among the Greeks and Syrians
 they neither are nor ever have been in use. They cannot
 therefore with any reason, be said to belong to the substance
 of Ordination.” So that if we may regard it as form, it can
 be only as making part of the prayers to which it is morally
 joined, and which are more than sufficient to determine it,
 even in the English Ritual, as we shall see.

Particular
 formulæ.

2. Even were this form of words as ancient and universal
 as it is the contrary, the supposition would be equally far from
 the truth. For, as the learned Morinus has very judiciously ob-
 served, it is ridiculous to imagine that in a body of ceremonies
 and prayers, it is some certain words rather than others which
 cause the validity of a Sacrament, especially when these
 words have not been determined by Jesus Christ. “^cIt is
 necessary to observe,” says this author, “what I suppose no
 one will deny, that it is certain as a matter of faith that a
 Sacrament administered according to the form prescribed
 in the Roman Pontifical or Ritual, is duly administered, and
 that on its own part nothing is therein wanting for producing
 its proper effects in the receiver: but it is no necessary point of
 faith to believe, what the Scholastic Doctors are divided about,
 that the form and matter of the Sacrament is contained in
 this part, or in these words, of the Ritual, unless the Church
 has expressly declared that such is the case, or in public prac-
 tice, in cases of danger, the other parts besides these are
 accustomed to be omitted. For those assertions, that these

^b Apud Latinos (hæc verba) cepta sunt usurpari vix ab annis quadringentis. Apud Græcos autem et Syros nec est nec unquam fuit illorum usus. Itaque nulla ratione dici possunt ad Ordinis substantiam pertinere. *De Sacr. Ord.* part. 3. exerc. 2. cap. 2. § 2. p. 22.

^c Adnotare necesse est, quod nemo mihi videtur negaturus, certum esse de fide, Sacramentum administratum juxta ritum in Pontificali seu Rituali Romano præscriptum esse legitimum, nihilque ex parte sui illi deesse ad effectum in suscipiente producendum: verum non esse necessario de fide, quod Doctores Scholastici disputant, In hac parte, in his verbis Ritualis, forma vel materia

continetur, nisi hoc expresse dictaverit Ecclesia, aut publica praxi, cum ingruit periculum, his exceptis, cætera prætermitti soleant. Illæ enim assertiones, Ista Ritualis verba sunt Sacramenti forma, In his vero materia continetur, non autem in illis, Scholasticorum Doctorum sunt velitationes, quas concedet qui voluerit, et de quibus inter se sæpe dissentiunt. Contingit autem aliquando eorum aliquos a vero tam immaniter aberrare, ut in Ritu Romano ea pro solis materiis et formis adnotent, quæ ad Sacramenti tantum solemnitatem et significationis ampliationem spectant. *De Penit.* lib. 8. c. 18. § 2. p. 568.

words are the form of the Sacrament, that its matter is contained in these, and not in those others, are the disputations of the Schoolmen, which he who pleases may allow, and about which they themselves often differ. And it happens sometimes, that some of them are so prodigiously in the wrong, as to set down those things in the Roman Ritual as the sole matter and form of a Sacrament, which regard only its solemnity, and the fuller setting forth of its signification.”

It is not then on such or such opinions of Theologians, that the validity of the Sacrament depends, but on the exact observance of all that the Ritual enjoins; and this Ritual, as we shall see, every Church has, and is truly possessed of, the power of drawing up for herself, provided she always retains what is essential, which should be uniform every where. “^dFor the various sentiments of the Schoolmen in relation to the particular words of the Ritual, whether the form of the Sacrament be in these or in those, are no obstruction to the efficacy of the Sacraments, when what is prescribed in the Ritual is duly observed.” It is then a chimerical pretence to make the validity of Ordination depend on a particular formula, and it would not be proving any thing against Parker’s Ordination, to confine one’s self to such an objection.

3. But let us even suppose for a moment that this form of words, *Receive the Holy Ghost*, is essential to the validity of Ordination; how will it be proved that the validity even of this very formula depends on the words added to it in the time of Charles the Second to determine it, that is to say, on these: *for the Office and Work of a Bishop or of a Priest*. M. L’Abbé Renaudot’s argument supposes it, and this is the second mistake he is guilty of in his supposition; a mistake which is refuted not only by comparing the modern Roman Pontifical with the English Ritual, but by this consideration likewise, that up to this time there is no example of a similar addition. For as to the Ordination of Priests, the formula used in Edward the Sixth’s Ritual is exactly the same with that in the Roman Pontifical, where we read these words: *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum. Quorum remiseric peccata, remittuntur eis; et quorum retinueris, retenta sunt.* [“Receive the [John 20. 23.]

^d Nihil enim variæ Scholasticorum opiniones de Ritualis verbis, an hic vel illic sit Sacramenti forma, Sacra-

mentorū virtuti, cum omnia in Rituali præscripta rite administrantur, officunt. *Morin. ibid.*

CHAP. Holy Ghost. Whose soever sins thou dost remit, they are re-
 VII. mitted unto them; and whose soever thou dost retain, they are retained.”] And as to the Ordination of Bishops, there are no other words joined to the imposition of hands in the Roman Pontifical, but these only, *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum*. Now I ask, whether in the case of either Ordination, these words are more determinate in the Roman Pontifical, than they are in the English Ritual? and why, with regard to this latter, a clause is thought essential, of which the addition has not been judged necessary any where else?

Objection. It will be said perhaps, that in the Roman Pontifical these words *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum*, are sufficiently determined by the prayers which are added at every Ordination, and which clearly distinguish that of Bishops from that of Priests; but that this is not the case with the English Ritual.

Answer. This is the only reason that could give any weight to the objection, were it true; but unluckily for M. L’Abbé Renaudot, we shall shew at once that the two Ordinations are fully distinguished in this Ritual, and that the form of words in question is therein very accurately determined to the Episcopate or Priesthood, by the prayers and ceremonies which distinguish these two Ordinations.

Ordination of Priests. ^e For, first, as to what concerns the Ordination of Priests, the Archdeacon presents them to the Bishop, as in the Roman Pontifical, saying, *Reverend Father in God, I present unto you these Persons present, to be admitted to the Order of Priesthood*. Then the Bishop declares to the people the Ordination he is about to perform, that, if any one knows any canonical impediment against it, he may discover it. *Good people, these be they whom we purpose, God willing, to receive this day unto the holy Office of Priesthood*. Then follows the Litany, in which is inserted this prayer: ^f *That it may please Thee to bless these Thy servants, now to be admitted to the Order of Priests*,— And this Litany is followed by a prayer in behalf of those who are being ordained, which marks expressly that they are set apart for the Priesthood: *Almighty God, giver of all good things, which by Thy Holy Spirit hast appointed diverse Orders of Ministers in Thy Church; Mercifully behold these Thy servants, now called to the Office of Priesthood, &c.*

^e The Forms of both these Ordinations are printed at length, among the Proofs.

^f [See the Editor’s notes.]

We see next the exhortation made by the Bishop to the Priests, to lay before them the obligations of their Office, and the duties of their Ministry; and immediately afterwards the questions which the Bishop puts to them, and the promises he requires of them. The first of these questions relates to their calling: *Do you think in your heart that you be truly called, according to the will of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the Order of this Church of England, to the Ministry of Priesthood?* At length comes the prayer which serves instead of the Preface found in the Roman Pontifical, and thanks are there given to God for the favour He shews His Church in supplying it with these new Priests: *For these so great benefits of Thy eternal goodness, and for that Thou hast vouchsafed to call these Thy servants here present to the same Office and Ministry of the salvation of mankind, we render unto Thee most hearty thanks.* And after this prayer follows the imposition of hands, accompanied by these words: *Receive the Holy Ghost: Whose sins thou dost forgive, &c.* After which the Bishop delivers the Holy Bible into the Priests' hands, giving them authority to preach the word of God: *Take thou authority to preach the word of God, &c.* Is there any thing more in the Roman Pontifical to determine the formula *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum?* and can it be fair to maintain that this formula, after all, still continues equivocal?

The Ordination of Bishops is as distinctly characterized as the other. For first of all, two Bishops present the Bishop Elect to the Archbishop, saying, *Most reverend Father in God, we present unto you this godly and well learned man to be consecrated Bishop.* Then the Litany is said, in which these words are used: *That it may please Thee to bless this our Brother elected, and to send Thy grace upon him,—* And this Litany concludes with the following prayer: *Almighty God, giver of all good things, which by Thy Holy Spirit hast appointed diverse Orders of Ministers in Thy Church; Mercifully behold this Thy servant now called to the Work and Ministry of a Bishop;—* The same question is likewise put to the Bishops, that was put to the Priests, whether they are persuaded that they are called by God to the Ministry for which they are presented? Also, [§] whether they will be faithful in ordaining

Ordination of Bishops.

§ [See the Editor's notes.]

CHAP.
VII.

worthy Ministers, and laying hands upon them? whether they will make use of the authority which God puts into their hands for restraining the wicked, for banishing all erroneous doctrines, and for maintaining peace, quietness, and love in the Church? all questions of such a nature, as manifestly characterize the Bishop, and are of themselves sufficient to determine the form in question, even though there were nothing else to do it. These questions are followed by a prayer, in which God is asked to give the person ordained grace to fulfil all the duties of a Bishop; and this prayer is followed by the imposition of hands, accompanied with these words: *Take the Holy Ghost, and remember that thou stir up the grace of God &c.* and by the delivery of the Book of the Gospels, which is put into the new Bishop's hands with an exhortation to acquit himself faithfully of all the duties of a good Pastor. If these words are not sufficiently determined by what precedes and accompanies them, I know not what would be required to determine them.

The Ro-
man Pon-
tiffical.

And, in fact, what is there more in the Roman Pontiffical, to determine this form of words? All the world may compare them together, and be easily convinced of this fact, that, excepting the prayers annexed to certain ceremonies that are laid aside in the English Ritual, there is nothing more expressive or stronger to determine the formula *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum* on one side than on the other. The presenting of the person, as well as the Litany, is the same in both. The questions in the English Ritual seem to suit Bishops much better than those of the Pontiffical. The prayers are equally significative on both sides, and the advice, or particular representation of the Episcopal duties, is at least as distinctly characterized in the Ritual as in the Pontiffical. Why then should the want of the clause added by King Charles the Second to the formula *Receive the Holy Ghost* be judged essential, and sufficient to annul the Ordinations of the English, when the omission of that very addition is no prejudice at all to the Ordination of the Catholic Bishops?

The addi-
tion: sum-
ming up.

4. If the use of this formula is as recent as the inspection of the Rituals and Pontifficals proves; if the addition made to the formula itself is hitherto without example, and was never thought necessary to fix the sense of the words *Accipe*—; we

cannot but say, with a great number of Divines, even Jesuits, Vasquès, Hurtado, Mærat, de Rhodes, and many others, that the omission of this addition cannot alter the validity of the Sacrament; and that these words *Accipe*—are otherwise sufficiently determined. “ⁱBut you will object—,” says Mærat, “that these words, *Accipe &c.*—seem too general.—I answer, that they are so if considered individually by themselves; but not if considered together with the matter for which they are used; for by this their general signification is restrained and determined to express the Episcopal degree, and consequently the peculiar Office of Bishops.” The same thing is asserted by Father de Rhodes; and Vasquès adds a further reason, viz: that this very indeterminateness marks a more abundant effusion of grace; “^kfor,” says he, “it seems to be more for the Holy Spirit to be given absolutely, than to be given for this or that particular effect.” We may conclude therefore with Morinus, that this addition is of the number of those things which are inserted for the solemnity, or for a fuller explanation of the rite; ¹*ad sacramenti tantum solemnitatem, et significationis ampliationem spectant*; and that M. L’Abbé Renaudot has fallen into the gross error of those who take for the matter and form, that is to say, for the essential parts of Ordination, things that serve only to render it more solemn, or help to explain it. “^lIt happens sometimes,” says he, “that some of them are so prodigiously in the wrong, as to set down those things in the Roman Ritual as the sole matter and form of a Sacrament, which regard only its solemnity, and the fuller setting forth of its meaning.”

Error of Renaudot.

5. It will perhaps be said, that to make M. L’Abbé Renaudot place the essence of Ordination in this form of words, *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum*, or in the addition made to it by King

Objection.

^h Vasquès [al. Vasquez, vel Vazquez], in 3. part. [S. Thomæ,] disp. 240. t. 3. p. 740. [col. 1.] Hurtado [de Sacramentis et Censuris], de Ordine, p. 394. Mærat, [Disputationum] t. 3. de Ordine, p. 692. [col. 2.] De Rhodes, Theol. Scholast. t. 2. p. 662.

ⁱ At objicēs—, verba hæc, *Accipe &c.*—nimis generalia videri.—Respondeo, ita quidem esse, si præcise secundum se considerentur: secus autem si cum materia supra quam proferuntur: per hæc enim eorum generalis significatio re-

stringitur et determinatur ad Episcopalem gradum significandum, et per consequens, proprium Episcoporum officium.

^k Plus enim videtur esse, dari Spiritum Sanctum absolute, quam dari ad hunc vel alium effectum peculiarem.

^l Contingit autem aliquando eorum aliquos a vero tam immaniter aberrare, ut in Ritu Romano ea pro solis materiis et formis adnotent, quæ ad Sacramenti tantum solemnitatem et significationis ampliationem spectant. *Morin. de Pæn.* lib. 8. cap. 18. § 2. p. 568.

CHAP.
VII.

Charles the Second, is to attribute to him a ridiculous notion merely to make a merit of refuting it; that he never entertained such a sentiment, but was of opinion that it consisted in all that is prescribed by the Roman Pontifical; from which it followed that every change that could be made therein, whether by addition or by suppression, was sufficient to annul the English Ordinations.

Answer.

But it is easy to shew, that nothing is attributed to M. L'Abbé Renaudot, which does not belong to him. For he says expressly in his Memoire, that the form prescribed by King Edward's Ritual cannot be valid, the more because "this form is as well adapted to the Ordination of Priests as to that of Bishops; which was the reason why, at the Restoration of King Charles the Second, some words were added to it, to determine its sense either to the Priesthood or to the Episcopate." But it is certain it was to the formula, *Take* (or *Receive*) *the Holy Ghost*, that the addition was made in King Charles the Second's time. It was this form of words then which M. L'Abbé Renaudot looked upon as the form of Ordination; and one of his reasons for condemning it was, that it suited as well the Ordination of Priests as that of Bishops. But even though M. L'Abbé Renaudot had not said this in such express terms as he has done, yet his reasoning plainly supposes it. For an alteration made in a form of words cannot be deemed essential, unless that form itself be regarded as such. But the author regards as essential the omission of the clause added by King Charles the Second: he was of opinion then, that this formula was the form of Ordination; which is all that is attributed to him in the objection drawn from his Memoire.

This other hypothesis untenable.

6. I wish, however, that M. L'Abbé Renaudot had maintained only that the essence of Ordination consisted really in all that is prescribed in the Pontifical, and that no alteration could be made in it, without rendering the Ordination null. Even this hypothesis, though more rational and better founded than the other, cannot be supported. For although it is not always evident, and we do not know with an entire certainty, wherein exactly the matter and form of a Sacrament consist, it is none the less certain and clear that there are many things which can never be regarded as more than mere ceremonies.

Some things mere ceremonies.

Thus, for example, no one doubts that in the administration of Baptism a number of things, which have been added only to render the Office more solemn, as the Unctions and the Exorcisms, may be omitted without affecting the substance of that Sacrament. So, without leaving the subject we are upon, no Divine doubts that in the ceremony of Ordination, there are many things which may be either omitted or practised without affecting it, and that a man would be effectually made a Bishop, for example, though the ceremony of the Ring, the Mitre, the Gloves, &c. with all the prayers annexed to them, should be left out. What M. L'Abbé Renaudot says down, then, can no more be maintained at this point than at the other; and in order to judge of the validity of an Ordination, we must necessarily return to the usual distinction of what is essential, and what is not so. And though we cannot tell exactly what particular words rather than others constitute the form, we may mark clearly that many contribute nothing at all to it, and that provided we preserve the sense of the rest, we have all that is wanting to make the Sacrament valid.

And now to sum up this whole answer in a few words. ^{Summing} Either M. L'Abbé Renaudot places the form of Ordination ^{up.} in these words alone, *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum*, or in this form of words used jointly with the clause added under King Charles the Second, or lastly in the prayers dispersed throughout the whole ceremony; for we see nothing besides these three things to which we can attach the idea and notion of form in the Sacrament of Ordination. If it is in these words alone, *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum*, it cannot be said that the English Ordinations are less valid than those of the Catholics, since it has been clearly proved that they are as much determined in King Edward's Ritual by the prayers and ceremonies used with them, as they are in the Roman Pontifical. If he places it in that formula used jointly with the addition of King Charles the Second, the author must either condemn all the Catholic Ordinations, or honestly own that he is mistaken in making the validity of Ordination depend on a clause added without any example, authority, or necessity. If, in fine, it is in the prayers dispersed through the ceremony of Ordination, that M. L'Abbé Renaudot

CHAP.
VII.

dot makes the essence of the form consist; how dares he assert that this form suits as well the Ordination of a Priest as that of a Bishop, when these prayers are as different the one from the other in King Edward's Ritual as in the Roman Pontifical? Besides, since in this Ritual they have retained all the substance of the prayers of the Pontifical, and the precise words have never been determined, either it must be allowed that there was no defect in Parker's Ordination with regard to the form, or it must be proved that either the Scripture, or some decree of an Œcumenical Council, or the perpetual and universal practice of the whole Church, has annexed the validity of Ordination to one exclusive Formulary of prayers and ceremonies; for otherwise, what is contended for is absurd, and the objection without force or foundation.

CHAP. VIII.

[See p. 105] ANSWER TO THE SECOND DIFFICULTY. THE FORM OF ORDINATION PRESCRIBED BY EDWARD THE SIXTH WAS NOT PROHIBITED BY LAW WHEN PARKER WAS CONSECRATED.

It may perhaps be readily conceded that there was no essential defect in the form prescribed by King Edward's Ritual, but it may be said, that this Ritual itself being without authority, and prohibited by Law, we cannot regard as valid an Ordination which was made by a new Ritual, neither received nor authorized by any Church. But as they have foreseen that this fact would certainly be contested, M. L'Abbé Renaudot brings forward a piece of history which happened in Elizabeth's reign, whereby he pretends to demonstrate, that the English themselves owned the invalidity of the Ordinations made under that Queen, according to King Edward's Ritual. The fact, as M. Renaudot relates it, is as follows.

Bonner
indicted.

Bonner, in 1564, was proceeded against by Horn Bishop of Winchester, on account of his refusal to take the Oath of Supremacy. He returned no other answer to the indictment but that it was the business of Horn and the other Bishops nominated by Queen Elizabeth, to prove that they were Bishops. The Judges not choosing to decide any thing, the matter

was brought before Parliament, who declared, that the persons ordained according to King Edward's Form of Ordination, were true Bishops; but the prosecution against Bonner was dropped. Now, according to our author, this account proves that the Form of Ordination prescribed by Edward the Sixth was without authority. For, as Bonner had refused to acknowledge Horn as a Bishop, because he had been ordained by King Edward's Ritual, and the Judges did not venture to decide against Bonner, they determined thereby that they really did not look upon Horn as a true Bishop. Besides, the Parliament, before whom the affair was brought, let Bonner alone, and even excused him from taking the Oath of Supremacy; which was a convincing proof of Bonner's being in the right, and an admission of the ground he had alleged. It ought then to be taken for granted, that King Edward's Formulary was even then unauthorized, and that consequently Parker's Ordination should be deemed null and invalid.

That the Ordinations made according to King Edward's Ritual have been looked upon as null by the greater part of Catholics, is a fact which is not contested; but this is not the point in question. So, too, that Bonner thought the Bishop of Winchester's Ordination null, is what may be granted, without its bringing the dispute to a decision: but it is a false consequence to infer thence, that King Edward's Ritual was prohibited by Law, and that the English Judges approved Bonner's refusal on this plea. And the better to clear up this matter, which may be of some importance, we must have recourse to original documents, and not confine ourselves to what some interested writers have advanced, who strain every thing to suit their prejudices, and without distinction confound truth and falsehood as their caprice leads them.

It is unanimously agreed, then, that the Bishop of Winchester having had the Oath of Supremacy tendered to Bonner, he refused it, for two reasons. 1. Because he believed it unlawful. And, 2. Because Horn had no right to require it of him. ^{What is agreed.} Upon this refusal, Horn had him indicted in the King's-Bench, whereupon they assigned him, according to

^a Heylin, Hist. Ref. p. 345. [vol. 2. p. 173.] Collier, Eccl. Hist. vol. 2. p. 492, 493.

CHAP.
VIII.

custom, Counsel to plead for him. These Counsel were Ployden, Wray, and Lovlace. It is not necessary here to quote all that they alleged to justify Bonner's refusal; it is enough to insist on the reasons which relate to the validity of Horn's Ordination, and are taken from Bonner's own draught of them, of which some writers have given us the summary.

Two pleas. Among the rest I find two. The first, which is given us by the author of the Annals of the Reformation under Queen Elizabeth^b, is that this Doctor had not been consecrated according to the Laws and Statutes of the Realm, which required that a Bishop should be ordained by his Metropolitan and two other Bishops, or else by four Bishops, which had not been done in his case. The other, which Heylin and Collier take notice of in their Histories^c, is that the form of Consecration of Archbishops and Bishops, which had been approved in the Parliament held under Edward the Sixth, had been repealed in the first year of Queen Mary, and had not been re-established at the time when Horn was consecrated Bishop of Winchester; whence Bonner's Counsel argued, that this Ordination, being conformable neither to the Roman Pontifical, which had been revived on Queen Mary's coming to the Crown, nor to the Laws, which had not as yet re-established Edward the Sixth's Ritual,—that this Ordination, I say, was absolutely null, and consequently Horn was not really a Bishop.

What is
not agreed.

Thus far all writers are sufficiently agreed; but I am far from granting that these reasons were allowed by the Judges, much less that they were of Bonner's opinion, that Horn was not really a Bishop. This is so much the less probable, because these two reasons are inconclusive, being founded on facts that are false.

The first
fact false.

First, it is false in fact, that they did not observe in Horn's case the Laws of the Kingdom, made the twenty-fifth year of Henry the Eighth, concerning the Consecration of Bishops, since it is evident from Parker's Register^d, that Horn and Scambler, Bishop of Peterborough, were consecrated Feb. 16,

^b Strype's Annals, vol. 3. c. 34. p. 173.] Collier, Eccl. Hist. vol. 2. p. 312. [vol. 1. p. 381. Ed. 3. (1735.)] 493.

^c Heylin, Hist. Ref. p. 345. [vol. 2. ^d Reg. Parker. fol. 88.]

156^p, by Parker himself, assisted by the Bishops of St. David's, of London, and of Coventry.

If Bonner, and after him Stapleton, reproached Horn with Stapleton. not being consecrated, it was not because they were ignorant of this Consecration, but because they maintained that the Consecrators themselves were not Bishops. “^e Who knows not” [† says Stapleton,] “that you and your Colleagues were ordained, I will not say differently from what the Canons of the Church require, but not even according to the direction of your own Statutes? With what front then, with what face, do you dare to arrogate to yourself the title of ‘Lord Bishop of Winchester’, which all Laws, as well Municipal as Ecclesiastical, deny you?” It is not, we see, Ordination absolutely, but a Canonical Ordination, and one made according to Law and ancient usage, which Stapleton denies Horn. “^f For this reason,” says he, “you are no Bishop, because—neither will you ever be able to shew an approved and accustomed calling or Consecration.” And he was of opinion, that this want of a canonical and regular Consecration, was a sufficient reason for his not acknowledging Horn for a Bishop. “^g For although he—has styled ‘Bishop of Winchester’, one whom he knew sufficiently to be destitute alike of a lawful call and a Canonical Consecration,—I nevertheless—declare truly, that you are neither a Bishop, nor ‘Lord Bishop of Winchester’.” All Stapleton’s reasoning, then, proves no more than this, that Horn was not consecrated after a canonical and lawful manner. But does it follow from a Bishop’s not having been consecrated canonically, and from his having intruded into a See from which his predecessor has been unlawfully deposed,—does it follow thence, that his Ordination is invalid? Stapleton proves no such thing, and the contrary is now regarded as an established principle.

^e Quis nescit te tuosque collegas, non dico aliter quam requirunt Canones Ecclesie, sed nec secundum præscriptum statutorum vestrorum ordinatos esse? Qua ergo fronte, qua facie, nomen Domini Episcopi Wintoniensis tibi arrogare audes, quo leges omnes, tam Municipales quam Ecclesiasticas, merito te privant? *Stapletoni opera*, tom. 2. p. 839, 840.

^f Propterea non Episcopus, quia—

nec approbatam et assuetam vocationem aut consecrationem ostendere unquam poteris. *Ib.* p. 839, A.

^g Nam licet—*Episcopum Wintoniensem* appellaverit, quem satis novit et legitima vocatione et canonica consecratione destitutum,—ego tamen—vere denuncio te nec Episcopum esse, nec *Domium Episcopum Wintoniensem*. *Ibid.* p. 838, D.

CHAP.
VIII.

Nothing therefore can be more false, than the first cause of refusal alleged by Bonner, it being founded on the want of a Consecration by the Metropolitan assisted by two Bishops, whereas Horn was actually so consecrated, as is proved by the public Records and Registers.

Plea 2.

Accordingly it was not this first reason that was most insisted on, but the second, viz. That King Edward's Ritual, which was used in Horn's Consecration, had not yet been re-established by Law, at the time of his Ordination, much less therefore at the time of the Ordination of Parker, who was ordained fourteen months sooner. But this second fact is no truer than the former; and if the Judges felt a difficulty in the matter, and it was referred to Parliament, it was only on account of an ambiguity which it is necessary to explain here, in order to throw some light on this transaction.

Second
fact false.

STATUTES.
2 and 3 Ed.
6. c. 1.

In the year 1548, King Edward had had drawn up a new Directory for Divine Service and the Administration of the Sacraments, called The Book of Common Prayer; and Parliament had ordered it to be used^h. In 1549, there was

3 and 4 Ed.
6. c. 12.

drawn up also, with the authority of Parliamentⁱ, a Form for the Consecration of Bishops, and the Ordination of Priests and Deacons, whose dignity and functions were still preserved, notwithstanding the alterations introduced into that Church; and in 1552, this Form was annexed to The Book of Common Prayer, which had been revised. This Book, thus revised and augmented, was again authorized by Act of Parliament, and this addition became part of that new Ritual. As this Statute is important for the clearing up of the difficulty before us, I shall give it almost entire, as preserved to us by the compiler of the Statutes of the Realm. It speaks

5 and 6 Ed.
6. c. 1.

as follows: ^k "V. And because there hath risen in the
"use and exercise of the aforesaid Common Service in the
"Church, heretofore set forth, divers doubts for the fashion and
"manner of the ministrations of the same, rather by the
"curiosity of the Minister and mistakers, then of any other
"worthy cause; (2.) therefore, as well for the more plain and

^h Statutes at Large, vol. 1. p. 645.

ⁱ Ibid. p. 674. and Heylin, Hist. Ref. p. 82, 83.

^k Statutes at Large, vol. 1. p. 676.

This and the following Statutes are given in their original language among the Proofs. [See the Editor's notes.]

“manifest explanation thereof, as for the more perfection of the
 “said order or Common Service, in some places where it is
 “necessary to make the same Prayer and fashion of Service
 “more earnest and fit to stir Christian people to the true
 “honouring of Almighty God, (3.) The King’s most excellent
 “Majesty, with the assent of the Lords and Commons in this
 “present Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the
 “same, hath caused the aforesaid order of Common Service,
 “entituled, The Book of Common-Prayer, to be faithfully
 “and godly perused, explained, and made fully perfect, and by
 “the aforesaid authority hath annexed and joined it, so ex-
 “plained and perfected, to this present Statute; (4.) adding
 “also a form and manner of making and consecrating of
 “Archbishops, Bishops, Priests and Deacons, to be of like
 “force, authority and value, as the same like foresaid Book,
 “entituled, The Book of Common-Prayer, was before, and to
 “be accepted, received, used, and esteemed in like sort and
 “manner, and with the same clauses of provisions and excep-
 “tions, to all intents, constructions and purposes, as by
 “the Act of Parliament made in the Second year of the
 “King’s Majesty’s Reign, was ordained, limited, expressed
 “and appointed for the uniformity of Service and Adminis-
 “tration of the Sacraments throughout the Realm, upon such
 “several pains as in the said Act of Parliament is expressed:
 “(5.) And the said former Act to stand in full force and
 “strength, to all intents and constructions, and to be applied,
 “practised, and put in ure, to and for the establishing of the
 “Book of Common-prayer, now explained, and hereunto
 “annexed, and also the said form of making of Archbishops,
 “Bishops, or Priests and Deacons, hereunto annexed, as
 “it was for the former Book.” These words, “and also the
 “said form of making of Archbishops,—hereunto annexed, as it
 “was for the former Book,” are particularly remarkable, and
 “must not be lost sight of in the examination of the difficulty
 “before us.

This Statute was repealed in 1553, the first year of 1 Mar.
 Queen Mary¹. The Book of Common-Prayer was abolished, Sess. 2. c. 2.
 and the use of the Roman Pontifical resumed in the Ordination

¹ Statutes at Large, vol. 1. p. 709. Heylin, Hist. Ref. p. 298. [vol. 2. p. 28.]

CHAP.
VIII.

of Bishops [&c.] But one of the first cares of Elizabeth, as soon as she had ascended the throne, was to restore things to the footing on which they stood in King Edward's time; and for this end, in her first Parliament, held in 1559, the Book of Common-Prayer was re-established, and recovered all the authority it had had before. This Statute was prior to all the Ordinations made in Elizabeth's reign; and as it is on it that the determination of our question depends, it is important to adduce it here, as preserved to us by the compiler of the Acts of Parliament. It is as follows: ^m“Where at the death of—King Edward the Sixth, there remained one uniform order of Common Service and Prayer, and of the Administration of the Sacraments,—set forth in one Book, intituled, The Book of Common-Prayer, and Administration of Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonies in the Church of England, authorized by Act of Parliament, holden in the fifth and sixth years of—King Edward the Sixth,—; the which was repealed and taken away by Act of Parliament in the first year of—Queen Mary, to the great decay of the due honour of God, and discomfort to the professors of the truth of Christ's Religion: II. Be it therefore enacted by the authority of this present Parliament, That the said Estatute of Repeal, and every thing therein contained, only concerning the said Book, and the Service, Administration of the Sacraments, Rites and Ceremonies, contained or appointed in or by the said Book, shall be void and of none effect, from and after the Feast of the Nativity of St. John Baptist next coming; (2.) And that the said Book—, with the Alterations and Additions therein added and appointed by this Estatute, shall stand and be—in full force and effect,—; any thing in the aforesaid Estatute of Repeal to the contrary notwithstanding. III. And further be it enacted— That all and singular Ministers in any Cathedral or Parish Church—shall from and after the Feast of the Nativity of St. John Baptist next coming, be bounden to say and use the Mattens, Even-song, Celebration of the Lord's Supper, and administration of each of the Sacraments, and all the Common and open prayer, in such order and form as is

1 Eliz. c. 2.

^m Statutes at Large, vol. 1. p. 763.

“mentioned in the said Book so authorized by Parliament, in
 “the said fifth and sixth years of the Reign of King Edward
 “the Sixth,” *with the alterations and additions enumerated,*
 “and none other or otherwise.”

Such is the famous Statute of the Parliament of 1559, made before the consecration of Parker, and consequently before that of Horn; conformably to which the Parliament of 1566 declared valid all the Ordinations made under Queen Elizabeth according to the Ritual of Edward the Sixth, as appears by this new Statute given in the same Collection. ⁿ“(2.) Be ^{8 Eliz. c. 1.}
 “it now declared and enacted by the Authority of this present
 “Parliament, that the said Act and Statute made in the first
 “year of the Reign of our said Sovereign Lady the Queen’s
 “Majesty, whereby the said Book of Common-Prayer—is
 “authorized and allowed to be used, shall stand and remain
 “good and perfect to all respects and purposes: (3.) And
 “that such order and form for the consecrating of Arch-
 “bishops and Bishops, and for the making of Priests, Deacons
 “and Ministers, as was set forth in the time of the said
 “late King Edward the Sixth, and added to the said Book
 “of Common-Prayer, and authorized by Parliament in the
 “fifth and sixth years of the said late King, shall stand and
 “be in full force and effect,—: IV.—: V. And that all
 “persons that have been, or shall be made, ordered or con-
 “secrate Archbishops, Bishops, &c. after the form and order
 “prescribed in the said order and form how Archbishops, &c.
 “should be consecrated, made and ordered, be in very deed,
 “and also by authority hereof declared and enacted to
 “be, and shall be Archbishops, Bishops, Priests, Ministers
 “and Deacons, and rightly made, ordered and conse-
 “crated; &c.”

It seems plain from the bare reading of these two last ^{Result} Statutes, that the Ritual of Edward the Sixth had been re-established in the first year of Elizabeth’s reign, *i. e.* in 1559. How then could Bonner and Stapleton say that Horn, who was ordained according to that Ritual in 1561, had not been consecrated according to the laws of the Realm? And how could the Judges be under any difficulty in determining on this head? This is what I must now explain.

ⁿ Ibid. p. 816. Sect. III. and V.

CHAP.
VIII.
Cause of
the diffi-
culty.

By the Statute of 1552, Edward the Sixth had added to the Book of Common-Prayer, a Form for consecrating Bishops, Priests and Deacons, which was thenceforth to make a part of that Book. In 1553 this Book was abolished, and with it the Form for the Ordination of Bishops [&c.]. In 1559, when Queen Elizabeth caused the Statute of 1553 to be repealed, there was express mention made of the Book of Common-Prayer, but not of the addition that had been made to it, *i. e.* of the Form of Ordination, because it was regarded as making a part of the said Book. It was this omission which occasioned all the difficulty: for this Form having been expressly abolished in Queen Mary's reign, and not expressly re-established under Queen Elizabeth, Bonner's Counsel contended that the Ordination was null, and that Horn was no Bishop. This seemed a point of sufficient consequence to be brought before Parliament in 1566; and it was this that occasioned the last Statute I have adduced, by which the Ordinations made in Queen Elizabeth's time are declared good and valid, notwithstanding any thing that might be objected to the contrary.

The Ordinal part of the Prayer-book,

The Parliament, in pronouncing on the validity of the English Ordinations, determined clearly, that the Form of Ordination had been re-established in the year 1559; and considering the case attentively, they certainly could not have determined otherwise. For by the Statute of 1552 the Form of Ordination was made a part of the Book of Common-Prayer. The Statute is express; and Heylin, one of the Historians of the Reformation, takes particular notice of it. "And they", says he, *i. e.* the Bishops and Divines appointed to draw up the Form of Ordination which the Parliament had ordered, "applied themselves unto the work, following therein the rules of the primitive Church, as they are rather recapitulated than ordained, in the fourth Council of Carthage, Anno 401. Which, though but national in itself, was generally both approved and received (as to the Form of consecrating Bishops and inferior Ministers) in all the Churches of the West. Which book, being finished, was made use of, without further authority, till the year 1552. At what time, being added to the second Liturgy, it was approved of, and

° Heylin's History of the Reformation, p. 83.

confirmed, as a part thereof, by Act of Parliament, An. 5. Edw. VI. cap. 1.”

It was this Book, thus revised and augmented, which after having been suppressed in 1553, the first year of Queen Mary, was re-established by Queen Elizabeth in 1559. The Statute we have given of this last year mentions in two places the re-establishment of the Book, such as it had been approved and confirmed, not by the Act of 1548, but by that of 1552. But in the Book of Common-Prayer approved by Parliament in 1552, the Form of Ordination had been attached to and made part of it, as appears, 1. From the Edition itself of this Book in 1552, which is found in the library of M. le Comte de Scignelay, wherein, in the table of the contents, which are undoubtedly so many parts of the Book itself, we find as the 21st article this title, “The form and manner of making and consecrating of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons”; and wherein the date of the impression of the whole book is not till the end of this part of the whole work. 2. It appears with equal certainty from the words themselves of the Statute of 1552, which is conceived in these terms, “(3.) The King’s most excellent Majesty,—, hath caused the aforesaid—Book of Common-Prayer to be faithfully and godly perused, explained, and made fully perfect, and by the aforesaid authority hath annexed and joined it, so explained and perfected, to this present Statute; (4.) adding also a form and manner of making and consecrating of Archbishops, Bishops, Priests and Deacons, to be of like force, authority and value, as the same like foresaid Book—was before, and to be accepted, received, used, and esteemed in like sort and manner, and with the same clauses—, as by the Act of Parliament made in the second year of the King’s Majesty’s Reign, was ordained,—for the Uniformity of Service—throughout the Realm, &c.” This expression, *adding also*, is remarkable, because it proves clearly that the Parliament regarded the Form of Ordination only as an addition made to the Book of Common-Prayer. So at least it was understood by all the Kingdom; for they made no scruple of using the Ritual of King Edward for the Ordination of the Bishops nominated

and as
such, re-
stored
with it.

Table of
contents.

Words of
the Statute
of 1552.

CHAP.
VIII.

by Queen Elizabeth, thinking it re-established by the Act of Parliament which had been made for the re-establishment of the Book of Common-Prayer.

Heylin.

This is very judiciously represented by Dr. Heylin in his History of the Reformation^a. This business, he says, was brought before the Parliament which began the thirtieth of September 1566, "where all particulars being fully and considerately discoursed upon," it was declared that the Form of Ordinations having been added in 1552 to the Book of Common-Prayer, "as a member of it," [says Heylin,] "or at least an appendant to it," their having forgotten to mention it expressly when they re-established the Book of Common-Prayer, was an omission of no consequence, and that it had been re-established, if not *in terminis* [in express terms], at least in the intention of the Parliament. That, however, the words of the said Statute having given rise to some doubt, they re-enacted it anew, and declared accordingly that all those who had been or should be ordained according to that Form, were and should be held to be rightly ordained, and to be true Bishops, &c. This, as we have seen above, is the exact purport of the Statute of 1566.

The 36th
Article.

But before the Parliament had declared their sense on this difficulty, it was not doubted that the Form of Ordination was included in the re-establishment of the Book of Common-Prayer. This is seen clearly from the 36th article of the Convocation held at London in 1562. ^r "The Book of Consecration of Archbishops and Bishops, and Ordering of Priests and Deacons, lately set forth in the time of Edward the Sixth, and confirmed at the same time by authority of Parliament," says this Convocation, "doth contain all things necessary to such Consecration and Ordering: And therefore whosoever are consecrated and ordered according to the Rites of that Book, since the second year of the forenamed King Edward unto this time, or hereafter shall be consecrated or ordered according to the same Rites; we decree all such to be rightly, orderly, and lawfully consecrated and ordered."

But how could the Convocation have judged valid the

^a Page 346. [vol. 2. p. 174.]

^r [Sparrow's] Collection of Articles

&c. [in Eng. p. 105: in Lat.] p. 221.
[Prayer-book, *Articles of Religion*.]

Ordinations made since the year 1559, unless the Parliament had then already given the Form of Ordination the same authority it had under Edward the Sixth? And how did the Parliament give it this authority unless by re-establishing the Book of Common-Prayer, of which the Form of Ordination had been a part since 1552. This is very well observed by Burnet. the learned Burnet Bishop of Salisbury, in his Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England. ^s“When Queen Elizabeth”, says he, “came to the Crown, King Edward’s Common-Prayer-Book was of new enacted, and Queen Mary’s Act was repealed. But the Book of Ordination was not expressly named, it being considered as a part of the Common-Prayer-Book, as it had been made in King Edward’s time; so it was thought no more necessary to mention that Office by name, than to mention all the other Offices that are in the Book. Bishop Bonner set on foot a nicety, That since the Book of Ordinations was by name condemned in Queen Mary’s time, and was not by name revived in Queen Elizabeth’s time, that therefore it was still condemned by Law, and that by consequence Ordinations performed according to this Book were not legal. But it is visible, that whatsoever might be made out of this according to the niceties of our Law, it has no relation to the validity of Ordinations, as they are sacred performances, but only as they are legal actions with relation to our Constitution. Therefore a declaration was made in a subsequent Parliament, That the Book of Ordination was considered as a part of the Book of Common-Prayer.”

The terms themselves of the Statute of 1559, would alone Statute of 1559. suffice to prove the re-establishment of the Form of Ordination: for though this Form is not distinctly mentioned therein, yet the Statute says expressly, that they re-established the Book of Common-Prayer, and every thing therein contained, relating to divine service, the administration of the Sacraments, and the rites and ceremonies of the Church. But is it not certain that the Form of Ordination must be regarded as making part of the administration of the Sacraments^t, or at least, if that be preferred, of the rites and ceremonies of the Church^t?

^s Art. 36. p. 377.

^t ^t Bramhall, p. 452, 453.

CHAP.
VIII.

Heylin.

Sanders.

Bossuet.

Moreover, the same Statute contains a repeal of the one which had been made in 1553, in the beginning of Queen Mary's reign, and of all it had enacted relating to divine service, the administration of the Sacraments, and the rites and ceremonies of the Church. But this Statute^u had before expressly repealed all that Edward the Sixth had ordered in relation to the Book of Common-Prayer, the Form of Ordinations, the Communion in both kinds, &c., and of this Dr. Heylin takes particular notice. ^x "By this Act," says he, speaking of the Statute of Queen Mary, "they took away all former Statutes for administering the Communion in both kinds; for establishing the first and second Liturgy; for confirming the new Ordinal, or Form of consecrating Archbishops and Bishops, &c.; for abrogating certain Fasts and Festivals which had formerly been observed; for authorizing the marriage of Priests, and legitimation of their children; not to say any thing of that Statute (as not worth the naming) for making Bishops by the King's Letters Patents, and exercising their Episcopal jurisdiction in the King's name only." But since the Statute of 1559 re-established all that had been repealed by the other in relation to divine service, the administration of the Sacraments, and the rites of the Church, and that repeal expressly comprehended the Form of Ordination; is it not evident that this Form of Ordination, which is one of the most essential parts of the administration of the Sacraments and of the rites of the Church, was re-established like the Book to which it had been annexed by a formal decree? Sanders makes no difficulty to acknowledge it, when, speaking expressly of the Form of Ordination established by Edward the Sixth, he says that Queen Mary repealed it, and Queen Elizabeth re-established it. ^y "These new Laws," says he, "Queen Mary repealed; Elizabeth restored and renewed." The late M. Bossuet Bishop of Meaux, whose testimony cannot be suspected in this dispute, was also so convinced of the evidence of this fact, that in his History of Variations, he recognises expressly that the Parliament of 1559 re-established the Form of Ordination appointed in King Edward's time. "Weak Bishops,"

^u Statutes at Large, vol. 1. p. 709.

^x Hist. Ref. p. 198. [vol. 2. p. 28.]

^y Has leges novas sustulit Regina

Maria; Elizabetha in integrum restituit ac renovavit. *De Schism. Angl.* lib. 3. p. 348.

says he^z, “wretched Clergy! who choose rather to take their Form of Consecration from ‘*the Book* LATELY (it was only ten years before) *set forth in the time of Edward the Sixth, and confirmed by authority of Parliament,*’ than from the Sacramentary of St. Gregory, the author of their conversion, . . . Upon this it was that these Bishops rested the validity of their own Consecration, and that of the Ordination of their Priests and Deacons; and they did so in conformity with an Ordinance of the Parliament of 1559, in which the doubt as to Ordination was resolved by a decree which authorized the Ceremonial of Ordinations annexed to King Edward’s Liturgy; so that if the Parliament had not made those Acts, the Ordination of all the Clergy would have remained doubtful.” Thus did that learned Bishop make no scruple to allow that from the year 1559, *i. e.* before any Bishop was ordained, King Edward’s Ordinal was re-established; and his testimony is fully equivalent to that of many others.

But what will appear more surprising is that, according to Jesuits. Bramhall^a, even the Jesuits against whom he wrote, desirous to establish the truth of the Nag’s-head Fable, did not at all contend that the Book of Ordination was unauthorized, but owned on the contrary, that the Parliament of 1559 had re-established it in full force.

This has appeared so certain, that even since the year 1566, the re-establishment of this Form and of all that relates to Divine Service, has been expressed in no other way than by that of the Book of Common-Prayer, it being judged rightly that the title of that Book alone comprehended all the branches of the Service of the Church. This appears by the Statute of 1662, passed at the commencement of the reign of Charles the Second, where it is said, ^b that Queen Elizabeth ^{13 and 14} having re-established in the first year of her reign, an uniformity in public worship and prayer, in the administration of ^{Car. 2. c. 4.} the Sacraments, and the rites and ceremonies of the Church of England, by the re-establishment of the Book of Common-Prayer, it was a great misfortune for Religion, that in the

^z Hist. des Variations [des Eglises Protestantes], liv. 10. tom. 2. p. 14.

^a Page 465.

^b Statutes at Large, vol. 1. p. 1198.

CHAP. times of trouble and rebellion, this order and uniformity had
 VIII. been laid aside; and therefore, to remedy it, that the King, with the consent of the Parliament, enacted that they should resume the use of "the Book of Common-Prayer . . . together with the Psalter . . . and the form and manner of making, ordaining, and consecrating of Bishops, &c."

It is clear that by this mode of expression Charles the Second professes only to re-establish what Queen Elizabeth herself had re-established by the Statute enjoining the use of the Common-Prayer. But Charles the Second re-established the Form of Ordination as forming a part of the Book of Common-Prayer, for he joins to this Book the Psalter with the Form of Ordination, and undoubtedly the Psalter was a part of it. There is then no room to doubt that from the first year of Queen Elizabeth, *i. e.* from 1559, before the Ordination of any Bishop, the Formulary of Edward the Sixth was re-established, and consequently was not prohibited by Law, when Parker was consecrated.

Objection. But it is objected, if Horn's Ordination according to King Edward's Ordinal was judged valid, why discharge Bonner from the prosecution commenced against him by the Bishop of Winchester, and approve thereby the reasons he alleged for refusing the Oath? For by thus discharging the indictment, they appear to have allowed clearly that Horn was not truly a Bishop.

Answer. This conclusion is neither just nor true. In 1562 the Bishops of the Convocation held at London had declared that the Bishops ordained by King Edward's Ritual, were rightly and duly consecrated; and in consequence they went on ordaining all the new Bishops according to the same Rite, without the intervention of any new declaration on the part of Parliament; a proof that what Bonner maintained was regarded as groundless.

When in 1566 this affair was brought before Parliament, a solemn declaration was there made, agreeably to the determination of the Convocation at London, that Horn and his colleagues were truly Bishops, and had been validly ordained. There was never any doubt on this head, and if Bonner's Counsel gave weight to this ground of refusal, it was because they could find nothing more plausible to allege

against the Bishop of Winchester. However, though they had no doubt as to the validity of the Ordination, yet as the Law was not so clear as it might have been, it was a sort of justice to acquit the accused, whose cause is always entitled to favour, when the Law seems to need explanation. Besides, as Dr. Heylin remarks^c, they considered “Bonner and the rest of the Bishops as men that had sufficiently suffered upon that account by the loss of their Bishoprics;” and were not sorry to treat them with some indulgence; the more because, as the author of Parker’s Life and Heylin^d say, they made it a rule to observe great caution and moderation in regard of the Oath of Supremacy, in order not to exasperate the Catholics, but bring them gradually by gentle measures to come into what was required of them, without raising any disturbance: “Which favour was indulged . . . in hope of gaining them by fair means to a sense of their duty”. In fact, it appears from a letter of Parker’s to Sir William Cecil Secretary of State^e, that Queen Elizabeth did not wish that any one should be pushed to extremities on account of the Oath, but in order not to disoblige those of her party who were desirous of the contrary, did not come forward herself in the matter, but left it to Parker and Cecil to manage the whole between them with circumspection. The Queen, as is certain, being in this disposition of mind, and her interest and views being the moving principle of all the resolutions of Parliament, need we be surprised that they should have discharged Bonner from the indictment laid against him, and at the same time solemnly recognised Horn as a Bishop?

It will perhaps be said, that so little was Bonner discharged from the indictment laid against him from any such motive, that the Royal Judges declared even in Elizabeth’s reign, that the Bishops ordained in King Edward’s time were not Bishops. This is pretended to be proved from a work of Lord Chief Justice Sir Robert Brooke, printed with that Queen’s privilege, out of which Champney and Ward have extracted this report^f: “*Dicitur que Evesqes in tempore E. 6. ne*

Why Bonner was discharged.

Objection. Brooke’s decision.

^c Hist. Ref. p. 346. [vol. 2. p. 174.]

^d Life of Parker, p. 125. Heylin, ib.

^e Heylin, ibid.

^f Life of Parker, p. 125, 126.

^g [Not the original French, but the

Latin and English printed on the next page. The French is Case 463. (fol. 101.) of the abstract mentioned in the next page but one, and published in 1587. and 1604. Ed.]

CHAP.
VIII.

fueront sacres, et ideo ne fueront Evesques, et ideo leas^h pur ans per tiels, et confirme per le Deane et Chapter, ne liera le successour. Car tiels ne unques fueront Evesques. Contra de Evesque deprive que fuit Evesque in fait tempore dimissionis, et confirmatio facta. B. Leases 68." A report which [omitting the last sentence] Champneyⁱ translates thus: *Dicitur Episcopos tempore Edwardi sexti creatos non fuisse consecratos, atque ideo non fuisse Episcopos; ac proinde locationes terrarum pro certo annorum termino per eos factas, confirmatas etiam per Decanum & Capitulum, successorem ejus non obligabunt, quia tales nunquam fuerunt Episcopi.* [And Ward^j into English thus: "It is said that the Bishops created in the time of King Edward VI. were not consecrated, and therefore were not Bishops; and for this reason, the locations of lands for certain terms of years by them made, though confirmed also by Dean and Chapter, did" (*read shall*) "not oblige the successor, because such had never been Bishops."] Such a decision given in Elizabeth's reign, shews what their idea was even in that Queen's time of the Ordinations made according to the Rite of Edward the Sixth, and how unsound and frivolous, says Champney, those who were best skilled in the Laws judged them to be. "^kThe Judges of the Kingdom, under Queen Elizabeth herself, so called in question the Ordinations of Bishops made under Edward, that they seem to have regarded them as null." But the same judgment must be formed of the Ordinations which took place under Queen Elizabeth, since they followed therein King Edward's Ordinal. They were therefore at that time looked upon as invalid, notwithstanding the pretended decisions of Parliament, which had not been able as yet to satisfy the minds of men, and give them a favourable opinion of the new Ordinations.

Answer.

If what Champney here alleges were true, it would be difficult enough to reconcile what was done in Queen Elizabeth's time with the decision we have just given. But that writer has but endeavoured to impose on mankind, by a great assurance in the falsest things; and to refute him, little more

^h [Or, as in the edition of 1604, *lease*.]

ⁱ De Vocat. Minist. c. 13. p. 432.

^j Controversy of Ordination, p. 28.

^k Judices Regni, sub ipsamet Eliza-

betha Regina, Ordinationes Episcoporum factas sub Edvardo adeo in dubium vocarunt, ut eas nullas fuisse existimasse videantur. *De Voc. M. ib.*

is necessary than to give a straightforward account of the facts he is desirous to misrepresent and falsify.

Several proofs of this have been already offered: I shall here produce a new one. Sir Robert Brooke was Lord Chief Justice of England under Queen Mary. An ardent Catholic, he zealously maintained the side of the old Religion. Like most of the Divines of that time, he was possessed with the prejudice that the Ordinations made in King Edward's time were null, because they were not made according to the old Pontifical. Under the influence of this prejudice, when consulted as to the validity of the leases and contracts made by the new Bishops, he decided in his work entitled, *The Grand Abridgement, &c.* that they were null, because the persons who had made them were not Bishops. This decision is indeed Brooke's, and it is not in this point that Champney has been guilty of falsehood. But that in which he has wished to impose on the world is his advancing that this decision was made in Queen Elizabeth's time; *Judices regni sub ipsamet Elizabetha Regina*;—whereas in reality it was made under Queen Mary, as is easy to prove: 1. Because Brooke was dead before Queen Elizabeth came to the Crown. 2. Because the anonymous author, who has extracted from Sir Robert Brooke's work the most important cases that happened under Henry the Eighth, Edward the Sixth, and Queen Mary, sets down expressly to the second year of Mary the case in question: *1 Anno secundo Mariæ*. This work, which was published with the title of *Ascuns Novell^o Cases de les ans & temps le Roy H. 8. Ed. 6. & la Roygne Mary, &c.* and which may be seen in the Library of St. Geneviève, was not unknown to Champney, for he quotes it^m. So that it can only have been from a most remarkable bad faith that, in ascribing to the Judges of Elizabeth's time a decision which was made under Queen Mary,—in order to give some colour to the falsehood he advances, he attributes to Brookeⁿ a work printed under Queen Elizabeth, which is but an abstract from his work, as appears from the title, *Ascuns Novell^o Cases de les ans & temps*

Real case.

Champ-
ney's de-
ception.

¹ *Ascuns Novell Cases &c.* [Case 463.] fol. 101. [in both Editions.]

^m [It was from this very work, and with the very words *Anno secundo Mariæ* before his eyes, that he trans-

lated the passage above given! Ed.].

ⁿ [“Brokus in casibus novellis, placito 463. fol. 101.”]

^{o o} [*Novel*, Ed. 1604.]

CHAP. VIII. *le Roy H. 8. Ed. 6. & la Roygne Mary, escrie ex la ground Abridgment, composed^v per Sir Robert Brooke Chivaler, &c. la disperse en les titles. Mes icy collecte^a sub ans.* And indeed how could Brooke, who died in 1558, publish a work in 1587? There needs then only to refer each thing to its own time, and the difficulty will vanish. Champney's deception is so essential to his objection, that the bare exposure of the one leaves no shadow of reason on which with the least plausibility to found the other; and the distinguishing of the times destroys all the advantage which it is attempted to draw from this decision.

Objection. But, it may be said, if Sir Robert Brooke's judgment was given under Mary, it is certain at all events that it was allowed to be printed with privilege under Elizabeth, in the anonymous abstract from his work; and would this have been allowed if they had not doubted the validity of those Ordinations? Besides, it is certain that notwithstanding the Act of Parliament in 1566, a very bad opinion was still entertained of those Consecrations; since many years after the printing of the extract in question, the Parliament held in 39Eliz.c 8. the 39th year of Queen Elizabeth, *i. e.* in 1597, was obliged to pass a new Act^r to confirm the Ordination of the new Bishops, and the deposition of the old ones. There was therefore always a doubt about the validity of those Ordinations; and the prejudice on this point was so strong, that the new Statutes could not easily remove it.

Answer.
Act of
1597.

Mere imagination all this. The subject of this last Statute is not at all the validity of the Consecration of the new Bishops. It does not say a word about it, nor does the Statute mention any doubt on this head. The fact was this. They learnt that some of the Bishops and other beneficed persons that were deprived, had drawn up appeals and secret protests against their deprivation, in order to use them in due time and place, and get a sentence annulled which they had cause to regard as unjust. Those who were in actual possession of their places, fearing some revolution similar to the preceding ones, thought it best to provide against these appeals and protests, and hence came this new Act of Parlia-

^p ^q [*Compose, and collect, Ed. 1604.*]

^r Statutes at Large, vol. 1. p. 922.

ment, which is printed at length amongst our Proofs. But this Statute, without speaking either of Consecration, or of any doubt raised on that subject, contents itself with annulling these appeals, and declares that the former Bishops and other beneficed persons had been lawfully deprived, that the new ones had been lawfully substituted in their places, that the vacancy of the Offices was real according to Law, and that the deprivation of the one and possession of the other, should stand good in spite of any appeal or question whatever. What inference can be drawn from this Statute which is not entirely on our side? Ordination was not at all the question in hand: if there was doubt at all, it was only on the part of the deprived; the business was only to render ineffectual their appeals, and it was declared that all the proceedings in their case were according to Law. How then can it be inferred thence, that in Queen Elizabeth's time the Judges were still in doubt as to the validity of the Ordinations?

As to the permission given in her reign to print the abstract from Brooke's work with privilege, it is the last thing in the world on which any stress can be laid. For it is the custom in England, that when there are found in Law-books any precedents or particular cases decided according to the Laws in force at the time of the decision, they do not suppress such cases when they come to reprint these books, even though the Laws themselves have since been repealed. After such repeal, these books are regarded merely as historical works, which shew the practice and opinion of the times when the case was so decided; and the Judges who allow the printing, knowing besides that the Law is no longer in force, regard less the time when the work is printed, than that in which it was written. Thus there was no cause to hinder the printing of this abstract from Sir Robert Brooke's work; for the decisions of this author being referred to the time when they were made, there was no danger of mistake; and after so solemn a declaration as that which had been made in the Parliament of 1566, there was no cause to apprehend that persons would ascribe to the reign of Elizabeth a decision made in the time of Mary; so well was the difference understood. This permission then is no proof that in Queen Elizabeth's time a bad opinion was entertained of the new

Reprint
from
Brooke.

CHAP.
VIII.

Ordinations; and Champney, by starting the point, has but given a fresh proof of his bad faith, since he hoped thereby to attribute to the time of Elizabeth a decision altogether opposed to the Laws, the practice, and the opinions, which prevailed in her reign.

Objection.
The dispensing
clause.

There is perhaps better faith in the last difficulty that he objects against us. It is that the Queen herself was so much of opinion, that the Ordination of the new Bishops was contrary to the Laws, which had abolished King Edward's Formulary and not re-established it again, that in the second Commission despatched for the Consecration of Parker, to cover this defect, she added a clause which she thought necessary to anticipate whatever might be objected against the validity of these Ordinations. "s Supplying nevertheless," says this Commission, "by our Supreme Royal Authority, of our mere motion and certain knowledge, whatever either in the things to be done by you pursuant to our aforesaid Mandate, or in you, or any of you, your condition, state, or power for the performance of the premisses, may or shall be wanting of those things which either by the Statutes of this Realm, or by the Ecclesiastical Laws, are required or are necessary on this behalf, the state of the times and the exigency of affairs rendering it necessary." But it cannot be doubted, they add, that this clause regarded especially the Form of Ordination, since the Statute of 1566 takes express notice of it in these words: "“(10.) And further, for the avoiding of all ambiguities and questions that might be objected against the lawful Confirmations, Investing and Consecrations of the said Archbishops and Bishops, her Highness in her Letters Patents—directed to the Archbishop, Bishop or others, for the confirming, investing, and consecrating of any person elected to the Office or Dignity of any Archbishop or Bishop, hath not only used such words and sentences as were accustomed to be used by—her Majesty's Father and Brother,—but also hath used and put in her Majesty's said

The Statute of
1566.

^s Supplentes nichilominus suprema auctoritate nostra Regia, ex mero motu et certa scientia nostris, siquid aut in hiis quæ juxta mandatum nostrum prædictum per vos fient, aut in vobis, aut vestrum aliquo, conditione, statu, facultate vestris ad præmissa perfici-

enda desit aut deerit eorum quæ per statuta hujus Regni, aut per Leges Ecclesiasticas, in hac parte requiruntur aut necessaria sunt, temporis ratione et rerum necessitate id postulante. *Rymer.* tom. 15. p. 550.

^t Statutes at Large, vol. 1. p. 815.

Letters Patents, divers other general words and sentences, whereby her Highness, by her supreme Power and Authority, hath dispensed with all causes or doubts of any imperfection or disability, that can or may in any wise be objected against the same,—” We see by this Statute that they suspected there had been some irregularities in the Consecration of the new Bishops. But such irregularity must necessarily arise either from King Edward’s Ritual having been unauthorized, or from its not containing what was essential to Ordination; so that, one or the other, either the Ordination was faulty by defect in matter or form, or for want of authority; and be the case as it will, it cannot stand good.

But, whatever use people may choose to make of this clause, it certainly cannot be concluded thence that the Consecration of the new Bishops was performed contrary to Law, and that King Edward’s Formulary had not been re-established in 1559. For, 1. If they had thought this clause necessary to supply the irregularity of the Ordination, they should not have omitted it in any of the Consecrations that were performed before 1566, since King Edward’s Form was not re-established by name till that year. Yet of all the Commissions issued for the Consecration of Bishops which Rymer has given us from 1559 to 1566, not one has this clause besides that of Parker. 2. All are agreed, and those of the Church of England as well as the rest, that the Prince can dispense only with human law, and that the matter and form of the Sacraments do not admit of dispensation. Archbishop Bramhall^u lays this down in express terms, and declares positively, that if any thing essential to Ordination was wanting, such a clause would not make it valid. 3. By this clause the Queen did not pretend to do more than supply any defect there might happen to be in respect of formalities and ceremonies not essential, as appears sufficiently from the very terms of the clause. *Supplentes nichilominus—siquid aut in hiis quæ juxta mandatum nostrum prædictum per vos fiet, aut in vobis, aut vestrum aliquo, conditione, statu, facultate vestris ad præmissa perficienda desit aut deerit eorum quæ per Statuta hujus Regni, aut per leges Ecclesiasticas, in hac parte requiruntur aut necessaria sunt, temporis ratione et rerum necessitate id postulante.*

Answer.
The clause
itself.

Various
arguments.

^u Page 453.

CHAP.
VIII.

Use made
of the
clause.

Act of
Confir-
mation.

For we see that she undertakes to supply only what might be wanting with regard to the Laws of the Kingdom, and the Ecclesiastical Laws. But the validity of Ordination does not depend properly on all this, but on the things prescribed by the Holy Scripture and practised by the Apostles, as imposition of hands and prayer, which are preserved in the new Ritual, and this they well knew it was not in Elizabeth's power to supply. 4. We see by the use, or rather the application, they made of this clause, that they never thought that it regarded what might relate to the validity of the Consecration. For of all the Instruments relating to Parker's Ordination which remain to us, I know of none wherein this clause is mentioned, except in those of the Confirmation of the Election, which took place on Saturday the ninth of December by the four Bishops who consecrated him on the seventeenth, and of the inthronization, which are acts purely civil: in that of Consecration, which is an act altogether spiritual, it is not mentioned. Bramhall has published the Act of Confirmation, and it will be printed entire at the end of this Treatise, to save the trouble of searching for it elsewhere: I shall content myself with transcribing here the passage which seems to me most essential. "x We William, formerly Bishop of Bath and Wells, now Elect of Chichester, &c. by virtue of the Royal Commissionall Letters Patent of the Most Serene—Queen Defender of the Faith, &c. with this clause—and likewise this addition, Supplying nevertheless &c. her Majesty's Commissioners—, specially and lawfully deputed, having heard,—. Therefore we, William late &c.—do, by virtue of our said Most Serene Lady the Queen's supreme authority committed to us in this behalf, confirm the aforesaid Election—, supplying by the supreme Royal authority, dele-

* Auditis,—per nos Willielmum quondam Bathon. et Wellen. Episcopum, nunc Cicestren. Electum, &c. Serenissimæ—Reginæ Fidei Defens. &c., mediantibus Literis suis Regiis Commissionallibus Paten.—Commissarios, cum hac clausula—ne non et hac adjunctione, Supplentes nihilominus &c. specialiter et legitime deputatos,—. Idcirco nos Willielmus nuper &c.—prædictam Electionem—suprema autoritate dictæ Serenissimæ D. N. Reginæ nobis

in hac parte commissa confirmamus, supplentes ex suprema autoritate Regia, ex mero Principis motu ac certa scientia nobis delegata, quidquid in hac Electione fuerit defectum,—. *Bramhall*, p. 453. [The passage is here given more exactly in the words of the Act, and for that purpose rather more fully, from the Register itself, as reprinted at the end of Bramhall's Works, p. 1043, 1044. ED.]

gated to us of the Queen's mere motion and certain knowledge, whatever may have been defective therein,—” Now by the use here made of the clause, it seems natural enough to conclude, that as in this first Ordination, they departed from the usage established in the preceding reign, they were willing to take precautions against the reproaches of the Catholics, and therefore expressed in the first Instrument, that the Queen, by her Prerogative, dispensed with all defects that might happen in the act through deviation from the Laws, and the incapacity of the persons. 5. I have scarce any manner of doubt, but that in this clause they had principally in view the persons of the Consecrators. Barlow, Scory and Coverdale had been deprived in Queen Mary's reign, and others put in their places. Though they still preserved their character of Bishops, yet it cannot be doubted that they were incapable of lawfully performing any Ecclesiastical Office, without first being canonically restored. But this had not yet been done: here then was a very considerable irregularity; and it was this they thought to remedy by the clause in question. For it appears that it was the irregularity with respect to the persons which they especially intended to obviate. *Siquid . . . aut in vobis, aut vestrum aliquo, conditione, statu, facultate vestris ad præmissa perficienda desit.*—What confirms me in this opinion is, that in the first Commission drawn up for Parker's Ordination, this clause is not found. But when they saw that the Catholic Bishops would not meddle with the business, and that the whole would devolve on the deprived Bishops, they found themselves obliged to add this clause, as if to obviate the irregularity there was in the choice of the persons appointed for that function. 6. Lastly, the clause in question does not say there was any defect in the Ordination, nor even suppose it; but only does what is practised at Rome, when they grant absolutions *ad cautelam* [for precaution], without enquiring whether they are necessary or no. They are a sort of superabundant precautions, or clauses of form, which are put in to obviate all cavils, and ward off all reproaches there might be any ground for making.—So long as we cannot determine exactly with which of these motives this clause was inserted in the Commission for the Ordination of Parker, it is impossible to conclude thence, that King Edward's

Probable
object of
the clause.

Absolu-
tions *ad
cautelam.*

CHAP.
VIII.

Ordinal was not yet re-established in 1559; because even on the supposition of its being so, there was still ground for the insertion of such a clause in the Commission, for the sake of other irregularities there might be therein.

The Statute of 1566.

What I have to add further to destroy entirely this objection is, that even the Statute of 1566 proves nothing against the validity of the Consecration. For, as Mason has very well observed^y, that Statute does five things. 1. It censures such as called in question the validity of the English Ordinations. 2. It recites the Laws on this subject. 3. It declares that what was necessary to Ordination was never observed with so much exactness as under Queen Elizabeth. 4. It confirms anew the Book of Common Prayer, with the Form of Ordination annexed to it. 5. It declares that all those who had been consecrated or ordained according to that Form, were, and ought to be acknowledged, rightly and duly ordained. But from all this there results nothing prejudicial to the validity of the Consecrations: on the contrary, the Parliament declaring that what was necessary to Ordination was observed more carefully under Queen Elizabeth, than under any other Prince, the presumption is that the clause in question was but a matter of mere precaution.

It is true the Statute takes notice, that to obviate the difficulties that might be raised against the Confirmation, Investiture, and Consecration of the Bishops, the Queen had inserted in her Letters Patent a dispensing clause: but this Statute does not say that these defects relating to the Consecration affected its validity; it supposes, much rather, that they did not affect it in the least, since the English Divines agree with us, that the Civil Power cannot make valid an Ordination in which there was any essential defect; and since the Prince or the Parliament are able to declare whether Ordinations are valid or no, but cannot give them a validity which they had not of themselves.

^y Vind. Eccles. Angl. lib. 3. cap. 7. p. 332.

CHAP. IX.

ANSWER TO THE THIRD DIFFICULTY. THE HERETICAL OPINIONS OF SOME [See p. 105]
OF THOSE EMPLOYED IN DRAWING UP THE FORM OF ORDINATIONS
APPOINTED BY EDWARD THE SIXTH, ARE NOT SUFFICIENT TO IN-
VALIDATE THE ORDINATIONS PERFORMED ACCORDING TO THIS FORM.

THE interest they have in annihilating Parker's Consecra-
tion makes them put every thing in requisition to destroy the
authority of the Form used in that ceremony. At first they
denied that it was used; and this produced the Fable of the
Ordination at the tavern in Cheapside. Afterwards it was
maintained in opposition to the public notoriety of the thing,
and of the express words of the Acts of Parliament, that this
Ordinal was at that time prohibited by Law. This second
refuge was as easily forced as the first; and now they are re-
duced to maintaining that this Form of Ordination having
been drawn up by Prelates infected with heretical views on
the very point of Orders, there is room to believe, that
the Form they drew up, marking clearly enough their errors,
cannot serve to confer Ordination validly. This is a difficulty
which, one should think, ought not to weigh with Divines,
and which moreover would make us reject their Baptism, and
their other Sacraments, as well as their Ordinations. But in
order to leave no scruple unsatisfied, I am willing to examine
this point with some attention.

It appears certain, that Cranmer and Barlow^a, two of the
Prelates appointed to reform the public Service and the
Formulary of Ordination, were in notorious error on the
subject of Orders. To be convinced of this, we need only
read over the questions concerning the Sacraments which
were proposed to several Prelates and certain Divines, whose
opinions it was wished to have. The original of these
questions has been published by Burnet and Collier in
their Histories^b; and it is of importance, in order not to
weaken the objection put forward, to give some of them. The

Vain ef-
forts of
objectors.

New ob-
jection.

Opinions
of Cranmer
and Bar-
low.

Questions.

^a Burnet, Hist. Ref. vol. 2. p. 61. p. 201—244. Collier's Eccles. Hist.
^b Burnet, vol. 1. Records, No. 21. vol. 2. Rec. No. 49. p. 40.

CHAP.
IX.
Qu. xii.

Qu. xiii.
and xiv.

Other
questions.

Qu. ix.

Whence
these opi-
nions.

twelfth question is, “Whether in the New Testament be required any Consecration of a Bishop and Priest, or only appointing to the Office be sufficient?” Cranmer, and Barlow after him, say that Consecration is not necessary, and that appointment alone is sufficient. The thirteenth^d and fourteenth^e questions ask, ‘Whether a Prince who had conquered an infidel country, or who in a Christian country had no Priests or Bishops left, might by his own authority appoint Priests and Bishops.’ Cranmer, Barlow, and several others affirmed he might. ^f*Menevens., Thirlebeus,—etiam potestatem ministrandi Sacramenta et ordinandi Ministros concedunt illis.* [The Bishop of St. David’s, Thirlby, &c. allow them also the power of administering the Sacraments and ordaining Ministers.] In their answers to several questions proposed with respect to the number of the Sacraments they always exclude Orders, except in the answer to the fourth question^g, where they extend the name of Sacrament to many things which are but simple figures, or simple ceremonies. In the answer to the seventh^h question, Cranmer and Barlow expressly exclude Ordination from the number of Sacraments having virtue. On the ninthⁱ they say, that the reason why the Apostles made Bishops on their own authority, was that there were no Christian Princes to whose orders they might submit themselves. In a word, we find in all these answers pure Presbyterianism without the least disguise, and it is but too apparent, that these Divines and Prelates aimed only at the extinction of Episcopacy. Cranmer had imbibed these opinions in the Lutheran Churches, with whom he had contracted a strict intimacy during his sojourn in Germany on account of the affairs of Henry the Eighth; and afterwards, on his return, communicated them to others. Barlow was undoubtedly one of the first; for in 1536, among several errors, which he was accused of having maintained, he was reproached among others with having advanced this proposition: ^k“*That if the King’s Grace, being Supreme Head of the Church of England, did choose, de-*

^c [Burnet, ib. p. 228.]

^d [“Whether, if it fortun’d a Christian Prince (learned) to conquer certain Dominions of Infidels, having none but temporal learned men with him, if it be defended by God’s Law, that he and they should preach and teach the Word

of God there, or no? And also make and constitute Priests, or no?” Ib. p. 231.]

^e [Given in full, p. 145.]

^f [Ibid. p. 233.]

^{g h i} [Ib. p. 208. 214. and 220.]

^k Collier’s Hist. vol. 2. p. 135.

nominate and elect any Layman (being learned) to be a Bishop; that he, so chosen, (without mention made of any Orders), should be as good a Bishop as he is, or the best in England." The most obstinate Presbyterian never went farther in maintaining the uselessness of Ordination; and can it be imagined that a Form drawn up according to these notions can ensure its validity?

Objection pressed.

In fact, supposing, as it appears certain, that Cranmer and those who assisted him agreed with the Calvinists and Lutherans, with respect to the Hierarchy of the Church and the need of Ordination, there is every ground to believe that Episcopal Ordination was preserved only for form's sake; and since they regarded this dignity only as they did a civil magistracy, of which the administration was independent of the ceremonies with which it was conferred, as they explain themselves in the answer to the ninth question¹, it is impossible they should ever have thought of ensuring the validity of Ordination in the sense of Catholics, and consequently, this Form is evidently defective and null. This appears to me what can be said of the greatest weight in order to make the most of the difficulty. Our next business is to resolve it.

Answer.

To do this effectually, two things are requisite. The first is to examine whether the supposition, such as the objection sets it forth, is true. The second, whether, even admitting the truth of the supposition, the consequence drawn from it is just. I begin with the truth of the supposition.

They begin, then, by supposing that the Ordinal was drawn up by Prelates prepossessed with heretical views on the point of Ordination, that is to say, who had adopted on this subject the principles, or rather the errors, of the Presbyterians, as Cranmer and Barlow. But the fact is not such as they relate

Fact.

it; and if in the Committee nominated to reform the Liturgy, there were some Prelates, or some Divines, who held these errors, we may assert that the majority were of a contrary opinion. In fact, according to Burnet and Collier^m, this Committee was composed of 'the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, the Bishops of London, Durham, Worcester, Norwich, St. Asaph, Salisbury, Coventry [and Lichfield], Carlisle, Bristol,

Majority differed.

¹ Burnet, Hist. Ref. vol. 1. App. p. 220.

^m Burnet's Hist. vol. 2. p. 61. Collier's History, vol. 2. p. 243.

CHAP. IX. — St. David's, Ely, Lincoln, Chichester, Hereford, Westminster, and Rochester; and Doctors Cox, May, Taylor, Heynes, Robertson and Redmayn'; and a part of these Bishops, together with the other Delegates who had been engaged in the reformation of the Liturgyⁿ, were employed to reform the Ordinal also. But it appears by the answers made to the

Questions.

Qu. vii.

For instance, on the seventh question^o, the subject of which was the efficacy of the Sacraments, Cranmer and Barlow excepted, almost all agree in their efficacy. ^p*Conveniunt præter Menevens. naturam septem Sacramentorum nobis tradi in Scripturis. Eboracens. effectus singulorum enumerat, item*

Qu. ix.

Carloliens. On the ninth question, viz. ^q“Whether the Apostles lacking a higher Power, as in not having a Christian King among them, made Bishops by that necessity, or by authority given by God?” all agree that Christ had given this power to his Apostles: ^r*Omnes conveniunt Apostolos divinitus accepisse potestatem creandi Episcopos*; nor do I find any one scarcely who gives in to the error of Cranmer, who was of opinion that there was no necessity to appoint Bishops by other ceremonies than lay Officers, and that the rites used therein were but a matter of propriety, and not of necessity. On

Qu. xi.

the eleventh question, viz. ^s“Whether a Bishop hath authority to make a Priest by the Scripture, or no? And whether any other but only a Bishop may make a Priest?” all except Barlow Bishop of St. David's, were of opinion that Bishops had such power: ^t*Convenit omnibus præter Menevens. Episcopos habere auctoritatem instituendi Presbyteros*; and almost all agree that they alone have this power. *Eboracen. videtur omnino denegare aliis hanc auctoritatem. Redmayn, Symmons, Robertson, Leighton, Thirleby, Curren, Roffen. Edgeworth, Oglethorp, Carloliens. nusquam legerunt alios usos fuisse hac potestate, [quanquam (privilegio quodam) data sit Moysi, ut Redmanus arbitratur et Edgeworth.]* On the twelfth question^u, which regards the necessity of Consecration [of Bishops and Priests], almost all were of a contrary opinion to Cranmer and Barlow, and

Qu. xii.

ⁿ [See the Editor's notes.]

^o ^p Burnet, vol. 1. Records, p. 214. and 217.

^q ^r [Ibid. p. 220. and 223.]

^s ^t [Ibid. p. 226. and 228.]

^u [Given in full, p. 142.]

thought Consecration necessary. ^x *Respondent Eboracens. Londinens. Carliolens. Leighton, Tresham, Robertsonus, Edgeworth; Curren, Dayus, Oglethorp, Consecrationem esse requisitam. Redmanus ait eam receptam esse ab Apostolis, atque a Spiritu Sancto institutam ad conferendam gratiam. Dayus, Roffens. Symmons, aiunt Sacerdotium conferri per manuum impositionem, idque e Scripturis; Consecrationem vero diu receptam in Ecclesia: Coxus institutionem cum manuum impositione sufficere, neque per Scripturam requiri consecrationem.* §c. On the fourteenth^y, Qu. xiv.

“Whether it be forefended by God’s Law, that (if it so fortune that all the Bishops and Priests of a Region were dead, and that the Word of God should remain there unpreached, and the Sacrament of Baptism and others unministered) that the King of that Region should make Bishops and Priests to supply the same, or no?” few were of Cranmer’s opinion.

^z *Fatentur ut prius omnes, Laicos posse docere. Eboracens. Symmons, Oglethorp negant posse ordinare Presbyteros; tamen concedit Eboracens. baptizare et contrahere matrimonia; Edgeworth tantum baptizare posse; nam sufficere dicit ad salutem.* &c. This

opposition between the opinions of the majority of the Prelates and Divines and those of Cranmer, shews sufficiently that the reformation of the Liturgy was not abandoned blindly to the views and erroneous opinions of this Archbishop, and that the preservation of the Hierarchy was not his work.

Cranmer overruled.

Even judging of what passed in this affair, by what passed in that of the Six Articles, so far was Cranmer’s opinion from being blindly followed, that on the contrary, there is ground to believe that he was altogether worsted. For in the affair of the Six Articles, he being of a different opinion from the Archbishop of York and some other Bishops, the Bill they had drawn up was adopted in preference to his^a, and he had the mortification of seeing these Articles approved in Parliament, and published by the authority of the Prince, in spite of the opposition he had there made, and notwithstanding all the credit which he then enjoyed with King Henry.

The Six Articles.

It would seem moreover that one of the chief views of this Committee was so to moderate matters between the Catholics and the Protestants, as in composing the new Liturgy and

Policy of the Committee.

^x [Ibid. p. 230.]

^a Burnet’s Hist. vol. 1. p. 258,

^{y z} [Ibid. p. 234. and 235.]

CHAP.
IX.

reforming the Ordinal, to satisfy both parties alike. We learn this from Collier's History. ^b“This Committee”, says he, “of Bishops and Divines moved gently in the Reformation. They were willing to satisfy the Court and the Act of Parliament, and at the same time find out such a temper as might not be shocking to those of the old persuasion.” It was in this spirit that the Liturgy was composed; and by the same they were guided in drawing up the new Form of Ordination. For this it was that they contented themselves with pruning away, in the administration of the Sacraments they retained, what they thought most modern and useless, while they preserved at the same time what they regarded as most ancient, and belonging properly to their substance. By what they retrenched they carried on the project of the Reformation, and by what they preserved they remedied, or rather prevented, the separation of the Catholics, whom they wished by all means to keep with them, by making as little change as possible in all that concerned the public service. Queen Elizabeth entered further into these views, and it was this that preserved to England her Hierarchy, and all that exterior worship, which makes other Protestants regard this Church as still under the dominion of superstition and Popery.

Of Queen
Elizabeth.

Summing
up.

It is not true, then, as they suppose, that all those engaged in the reformation of the Liturgy were of Presbyterian principles, that they chose to preserve Episcopal Ordination only for form's sake, and that they regarded Consecration as altogether useless. The error of some cannot without injustice be imputed to all; and at the time when the charm of novelty gave the innovators the greatest number of disciples, a great many Divines, and a good part of the Clergy, remained firm in the defence of the Hierarchy; nor indeed have there been found in any Church more zealous defenders of Episcopacy, than have appeared in the Church of England since the Schism.

Cranmer's
views not
fixed.

If we take even Burnet's account of the matter, Cranmer himself did not persist in his errors on the subject of Ecclesiastical Ordinations. “In Cranmer's paper”, says this au-

^b Collier, Eccl. Hist. vol. 2. p. 245.

or^c, “some singular opinions of his about the nature of ecclesiastical Offices will be found; but as they are delivered by him with all possible modesty, so they were not established to the doctrine of the Church, but laid aside as particular conceits of his own; and it seems that afterwards he changed his opinion; for he subscribed the Book that was soon after set out, which is directly contrary to those opinions set down in these Papers.” And in short, he was so little firm in his notions on this head, that in some writings found among his papers, and printed in Burnet’s History, he acknowledges Orders to be a Sacrament to which grace is annexed^d, and whereby the Church furnishes itself with Ministers who succeed one another, and on whom their authority is conferred by prayer and imposition of hands, according to the institution of Christ and His Apostles. The supposition then is very doubtful as regards the errors of those engaged in reforming the Book of Ordinations.

But let us admit for a moment the supposition in its full content: the question will then be, whether the validity, or invalidity of a form, which is to be supposed in other respects to retain and preserve all that is essential to a Sacrament, depends on the particular opinions of those who drew it up, in such sort that the same form shall be valid if it was drawn up by Catholics, and invalid if by heretics. For this is exactly our case, since it has been proved above, that the form of the English Ritual is the same as to its essence with that of the Roman Pontifical, and that they have preserved there all the fundamental rites, that is to say prayer and imposition of hands, which are the only things thought necessary by the ancients, as has been proved above. But in this case we maintain that the opinions of Divines have no manner of influence on the validity or invalidity of the form; and this, as it would seem, may be proved both by theological reasons, and by facts whose analogy may demonstrate clearly that we must reason on the English Ordinations as we have on other Sacraments administered by heretics.

The first reason, received at this day almost generally in Reasons.

^c Hist. Ref. vol. 1. p. 289.

^d Vol. 1. Records, p. 323. [The paper alluded to was of an earlier date: see the Editor’s notes.]

CHAP. IX.
Reason 1. the Schools, is, that the inward intention of the Minister contributes nothing to the validity or invalidity of a Sacrament. All that is required is, to do what the Church does and we do what the Church does when we observe all that is essential in the rite she prescribes, and also do it *per modum religiosæ ceremoniæ* [in the way of a religious ceremony], as the Schools express it. But all this is found in our case. All that is essential in the rite, that is to say, imposition of hands, and prayer or invocation of the Holy Ghost, has been preserved. The Ordinations have been performed in a religious manner, that is to say, according to the Laws in force and with a view to supply the Church of England with the Ministers of whom she had need. It is true that the particular intention of those who either drew up the new Ritual or conferred Orders according to it, might corrupt or alter the intention of the Church, but it could not annihilate it. So in the administration of Baptism, for instance, the errors of the Arians might certainly corrupt the intention of the Church, but their Baptism was esteemed none the less valid, when what was essential to the form was retained.

Reason 2. A second reason, and that which is the foundation of the Church's conduct in prohibiting the repetition of Sacraments which stamp a character, is that the intention does not manifest itself, and we judge of it only by the outward behaviour. In vain does a Bishop or Priest make a jest within himself of the Sacraments he administers; in vain does he believe them to be without force and virtue: it is not his opinion of them which renders them valid and efficacious; it is the execution of our Saviour's commands, and compliance with the essential ceremonies practised by the Church, which effects the kind of consecration, or, if you please, the character which is impressed. It is then by these marks, and not by the private opinions of those who have drawn up the Rituals, or conferred the Orders, that we must judge of the validity of a Sacrament and every other indication would be doubtful. But in the composition of the new Ritual, there is nothing to shew that its authors had any private view either of abolishing Episcopacy, or of establishing the inutility of Consecration, or of reducing every thing to the Presbyterian government. On the contrary, the way in which the new Ritual is drawn up

appears to destroy all these views. The two Ordinations of Priesthood and Episcopacy are carefully distinguished, and to the latter are preserved all the pre-eminences and prerogatives which raise it above the former. Every thing there sets forth the necessity of Ordination both for Bishops and for Priests; and moreover this Ritual is supported by the Laws of the Realm, which declare this Consecration indispensable. In a word, whatever may have been on this head the opinions, or rather the errors, of some of those who revised this Ritual, since it presents nothing contrary to the Catholic doctrine, no advantage can be drawn from these opinions and these errors to invalidate the forms they made use of in conferring Orders.

A third reason which may serve to prove that the validity Reason 3. of the form does not depend on the opinions of those who drew it up, is that, supposing, as we have done, that the changes do not alter the substance of the form, that is to say, the essence of the prayers which properly constitute it, it ought still to be regarded as the work of the Church, so as that they are still accounted to intend to do what the Church does, although they have introduced some changes and alterations in the ceremonial part. But such is the present case. The essence of the prayer which constitutes the form of Ordination, as we have seen in the sixth Chapter, consists in an invocation of the Holy Ghost, to obtain for the Bishop Elect the graces of which he has need to fulfil with holiness the duties of his Ministry. All the rest is but accessory to this, and may be either omitted or altered, without the Sacrament's being affected by it. But in King Edward's Ritual, the whole substance of this prayer has been preserved. They there ask of God to fill the Bishop Elect with His Holy Spirit; they invoke this Holy Spirit upon him: the imposition of hands, joined to the formula *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum*, is another kind of invocation, which declares the effect which God is prayed to produce. In fine, the whole ceremony in general is but a succession of prayers by which this Church begs of God to form her a Minister worthy of Himself, to animate him with His Spirit, to enlighten him with His knowledge, to fill him with His power, to grant him grace to watch with success over the flock confided to him, and to be faithful to all his duties.

These reasons are supported by the facts, and by the ex- Ancient examples.

CHAP.
IX.

amples of the ancient Church. We do not see that the validity or invalidity of the Sacraments has ever been determined by the opinions of those who drew up their formulæ, or by whom they were conveyed, nor has regard been had to any thing besides the substance of the form, however it might be expressed.

Arian
Baptism.

All know that there were no small difficulties with regard to the Baptism of the Arians, not only on the part of those who rejected that of all the heretics, but also on the part of those who admitted it; on account of the particular errors which the Arians introduced into the administration of this Sacrament. Nevertheless, because the essence of the form was there preserved, that is to say, the invocation of the Holy Trinity, their Baptism was allowed like the rest, and the council of Nice made no exceptions to their disadvantage; yet there would have been room to do so, if the private intention of the Minister could hinder the Sacrament from having its effect. Why will they have it that the private errors which are attributed to Cranmer and Barlow, have been more prejudicial to the validity of Ordination, when, as we have proved, they preserved all that was essential, and are not in this respect in a worse condition than the Arians?

Baptism
of the Re-
formed.

Among the pretended Reformed themselves, how many are found who attribute no efficacy to Baptism, and who regard that Sacrament only as a mere initiation into Christianity? But has it ever been thought that such an error ought to cause the administration of that Sacrament to be regarded as null? and has the repeating it to those who come back from this sect ever been thought of?

Other Sa-
craments.

What has been said of Baptism may be said of all the Sacraments; of the Eucharist, of Penance, of Confirmation, and the rest. There is no one of these Sacraments on which there have not been numbers of errors among the ancient and modern heretics, and there are few of the heretics who have not altered many things in the administration of these Sacraments. Has it ever been believed that for this reason these Sacraments were null, and that the private errors of those who introduced this or that change, either in the faith of the Church or in the performance of her service, took away from the Sacraments their virtue and efficacy?

It may be said that the principle is granted, but that in this case the application is altogether different: that it is true, the errors of the Ministers cannot at all take from the Sacraments their virtue, and that a light change in the ceremonies which accompany their administration, cannot at all diminish their force; but that here the case is not the same: that here the question is not of a mere change in the Rite, but of the entire change of the form; and that not only the Minister who confers in the name of the Church is himself in error, but that this form was drawn up in opposition to that used by the Church, and by men who having raised their standard against the Church, are no more accounted to act in her name; that we see nothing similar in the Sacraments whose validity has been acknowledged, and that antiquity furnishes no example which can be employed to authorize the validity of the English Ordinations.

This objection has something dazzling in it, but at bottom it presents nothing solid, and is already refuted beforehand. It has been proved that the change which took place in the form of Ordination, has nothing essential in it, and does not affect the substance. It is untrue then, that the question relates to more than a mere change in the Rite, and that the change introduced may make the new Ordinal to be looked upon as a form altogether new. But a change of this nature, made even with a design to introduce an error, does not render a Sacrament invalid, according to Father Alexander, *° Si ad- ungeret formæ hæc verba, . . . non quasi partem formæ Sacramentalis esse vellet, sed ut errorem suum indicaret, aut alios in eamdem hæresim pertraheret, vera esset ac rata consecratio, modo intenderet facere quod facit Ecclesia.* In fact, if the invocation of the Holy Trinity in Baptism were involved in the prayers drawn up for the administration of that Sacrament, would it be thought that this new disposition of invocation made a new form of Baptism? It is the same with the case before us. The invocation of the Holy Ghost still makes the form of Ordination; the change extends only to some words; it is not, as they suppose, made in opposition to the form of the Church, but on the contrary, with a view of restoring as

[°] Natalis Alexander, *Theologia Dogmatica et Moralis*, lib. 2. cap. 3. reg. 6. [See . 171, where the passage is translated.]

CHAP.
IX.

much as possible the simplicity formerly used by the Church in the dispensation of the Sacraments; and this is evident from the declaration made by the Prelates and Divines deputed for this work, that in the reformation of this part of the Liturgy, they had taken as their rule the Canons of the Council of Carthage^f. Will it be said that that Council could not be a rule to a national Church in drawing up the form of her Ordination? The thing would refute itself, and the example of the Church of Africa is a convincing argument for all other Churches that may wish to regulate their Liturgy and their worship.

Objection
answered.

If it be objected, that a conclusion cannot be drawn from the Church of Africa, because that Church was Catholic, whereas our question concerns an heretical one; I agree that in some respects we cannot conclude from the one to the other; but what I conclude is, that since the Church of England took the Canons of the Council of Carthage as her rule in her Ordinations, they did not pretend to oppose their form to that of the Catholic Church, but on the contrary, to restore to that form its ancient simplicity, and preserve to Episcopacy the distinction and pre-eminence it always had in the Church. This indeed gave so much offence to Calvin, that he could not forbear expressing his dissatisfaction in several of his letters, and regarding the government of the Church of England as a remnant of Popery which ought to be abolished. This is evident by one of his letters to Cranmer, wherein he explains himself in these terms: “^g External superstitions are so reformed, that there remain innumerable shoots, which continually sprout forth. Or rather, I hear that there is such a mass of Papal corruptions left, that they not only obscure, but almost overwhelm the pure and genuine worship of God. . . . Certainly Religion will never

Reproaches
of
Calvin.

^f Heylin, Hist. Ref. p. 83.

^g Sic correctæ sunt externæ superstitiones, ut residui maneant innumeri surculi, qui assidue pullulent. Imo ex corruptelis Papatus audio relictam esse congeriem, quæ non obscuret modo, sed propemodum obruat purum et genuinum Dei cultum.—Certe nunquam integra florebit Religio, donec Ecclesiis melius prospectum fuerit, ut idoneos habeant Pastores, et qui docendi munus

serio obeant.—Non multo levius mihi videtur aliud vitium, quod ex publico Ecclesiæ proventu aluntur otiosi ventres, qui lingua incognita vespertas cantillent. Nihil dico amplius, nisi quod te approbatorem esse ejus ludibrii, quod palam cum legitimo Ecclesiæ ordine pugnat, plusquam absurdum est. *Calv. Ep.* [Opp. vol. 9. part 2.] p. 62. Ed. 1667.

flourish until better care is taken for the Churches, that they have fit Pastors, and such as will in good earnest perform the office of teaching. . . . Another evil appears to me of little less weight, that out of the public revenues of the Church idle bellies are maintained to chant Vespers in an unknown tongue. I say no more, except that you are an approver of this mockery, which is at open variance with the due order of the Church, and is more than absurd." However inclined Cranmer may have been to conform to the discipline of Geneva in all its parts, we see clearly that he had not his own way; that he was obliged to follow the ruling party, which was that in favour of Episcopacy, and that the form was drawn up less according to his views than according to those of the Divines who were opposed to him; or even that he had then changed his opinions, as Burnet agrees he had.

When it is added that the Prelates and Divines who drew up the new Ordinal, ought not to be accounted to have acted in the name of the Church, because they had lifted the standard against her; this reproach is not peculiar to the English, it applies generally to all who have separated themselves from the Church by heresy or schism; and if such a reason has not prevented our recognising as valid all those Sacraments which they so administered as to preserve the matter and the essential form of the Church, the same justice ought to be allowed the English, who in their schism have preserved all the essential parts of Ordination.

In fine, it is not true that antiquity does not furnish any examples which may serve to establish the validity of the English Ordinations. What we shall say in the following Chapter of the power of a national Church in the matter of discipline, and of the different usage of different Sects, will shew unanswerably, that reason and examples prove alike the right of the Church of England to compose for herself a Formulary for public worship, and that the validity of her Ordinations ought to be allowed, as those of most of the other Sects have been allowed, whatever change they have made in their Rituals and Pontificals.

CHAP. X.

AN EXAMINATION INTO THE POWER OF A NATIONAL CHURCH IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE SACRAMENTS; AND WHETHER BY THE CHANGES SHE MAKES IN THEIR FORM SHE PREJUDICES THEIR VALIDITY, EVEN WHEN SHE DOES NOT MAKE THEM UNTIL AFTER SHE HAS FALLEN INTO SCHISM OR HERESY.

CHAP. X.
Summing up.

WE have seen in the preceding Chapters, that whether in respect of the matter or in respect of the form, nothing was wanting to the validity of the English Ordinations; and that whatever change the Church of England made in the prayers which may be regarded as the form of Ordination, this change did not affect the substance of this form, and that in this respect the Church of England did nothing more than what all the other Churches had done before her. That this change does not affect the substance of the form of the Ordinations was demonstrated by comparing the Roman Pontifical with King Edward's Ritual. It remains now to prove, that the Church of England, in making the changes she did, did only what the other Churches have done, and that nothing can be concluded thence against the validity of the English Ordinations since the Schism.

Power of national Churches.

General usage.

To prove this, it will be sufficient to shew that such has been the general usage, and that this usage is founded on very solid reasons. For in sound divinity, an usage founded on reason, becomes a complete proof to authorize other facts. But the practice is certain, and nothing is so easy as to satisfy one's self of it. I speak not here simply of a change in the matter of arbitrary ceremonies, which vary in every Church at the will of the Pastors: all agree that particular Churches have power to alter what they think right in these matters, observing only the subordination they owe one to another, in order not to disturb by indiscreet alterations the common peace, and the uniformity of worship, which both prudence and charity require them to maintain as much as possible. I say further, that in the administration of the Sacraments, particular Churches have made use of this power, and

M. L'Abbé Renaudot himself expressly acknowledges it when speaking of the Syriac Liturgies in the Preface^a prefixed to the second volume of his Oriental Liturgies; ^b *Igitur ex Episcopali auctoritate*, says he, *qua Orientales Antistites usi sunt, in ordinandis Ecclesiasticis Officiis, ut Baptismi administrandi formulas, Ritualesque libros cum adjunctis precibus, Coronationis seu Benedictionis nuptialis, Absolutionis Pœnitentium, et alia non pauca, ita quoque Liturgias scripserunt.* We see that he speaks here of the forms of Matrimony, of Penance, &c. and nothing is so easy as to prove it.

Of the number of the Sacraments recognised as such by the Catholic Church, there are some whose matter and form have been determined by Jesus Christ, and others of which the determination has been left to the Church. Baptism and the Eucharist are of the first kind; and the other Sacraments, so far at least as the form is concerned, of the second, and of this number is Orders. But with respect to these latter especially, and one might perhaps say the same of the former, particular Churches have thought themselves authorized to draw up their forms according to their own taste, without adhering strictly to the same formulary of expressions, but merely preserving the substance and spirit of the prayers which ought to relate to the effect of the Sacrament. This usage is undoubted: a few examples will prove it.

The form of the Sacrament of Penance consists, as Divines maintain, in the words of Absolution. But these words have varied with times and Churches. Let any one consult the different Orders of Service published by Fathers Morin and Martene, and he will scarcely find any amongst them whose words are exactly the same. And to begin by comparing the Greek Church with the Latin, we shall see that the form indicated in the Euchologies is not that of our Pontificals; and that amongst the different Euchologies, there is the same variety as is found among our Roman Orders.

In the work which Father Morin has published on the Sacrament of Penance, we find a little treatise of Gabriel of Philadelphia, which makes the form of the Sacrament of Penance to

^a [Not in what Renaudot himself calls the Preface, but in the prefatory] et Jacobitarum] Liturgiis, p. xiii.
^b [See p. 174, where the passage is translated.]

Two classes of Sacraments.

The second variable in form.

Examples.

Penance.

Greek forms.

CHAP. X. consist in these words; “*The grace of the Most Holy Spirit by my humility holds thee pardoned and absolved.*” But this formula is quite different from those which are found in the Euchologies published by the same author: for the form of that which is taken from the Barberine Library, consists properly of three prayers which are found after the question which is asked the penitent; and although the substance of Absolution is found there, it cannot be said that the form is the same as to the manner of expression. I will even maintain that there is less difference between the form of Ordination in the Roman Pontifical and that of King Edward’s Ritual, than there is between the forms of Absolution of which we are now speaking.

The Euchology of John the Monk has no greater similarity to that of the Barberine Library. The prayer which stands for the form in the first, and which begins with these words: ^a *Deus, qui propter nos homo factus est, &c.* is not found in the other, and so cannot be regarded as the same form except with regard to the substance. The Euchology of John the Faster, published also by Morinus, differs from the foregoing, in that besides the prayers that we read in the others, this contains several that are not found in them; which would induce me to think that this is the most modern of all. But be this as it may, if all these that we find there constitute the form of the Sacrament, it follows that each Church was at liberty to make her own form; and if some one singly be sufficient, it follows that regard was had only to the substance, without feeling any anxiety that the expressions should be the same.

Greek
and Latin
forms.

But if there is so little uniformity in the forms of Absolution used by the Greeks, there is yet less between them and those used by the Latins. The form which we now use has certainly, as regards the expressions, a very distant resemblance only; and it is astonishing that, though we see how little conformity there is between this and those either of the Greeks or of the old Latin Orders of Service, any one should be disposed to maintain that particular Churches have no power to regulate their forms, when the variety therein found cannot

^c Gratia Sanctissimi Spiritus per meam humilitatem habet te condonatum et absolutum. [*Cap. 8. ap.*] *Morin. de Sacr. Pœnit.* Append. p. 145.

^d [*Morin. ibid.* p. 115.]

otherwise be explained than by the power which the Churches have had to determine them in a different way.

Perhaps it will be said, that the variety found in the forms of Penance that have been published, arises only from this, that they are so many forms of public Penance; and that as this practice is less a Sacrament than a part of the exterior discipline which accompanies it, this variety of forms is not at all surprising. But this reply is a weak subterfuge which is not founded on any solid reason. For let Absolution be given publicly or privately, it is still a Sacrament. It is true that there is a sort of public Absolution, which, properly speaking, is only a relaxation of a censure or an interdict; but it is nothing of this kind which is the business of the ancient Offices of Penance, where there is no question but of the absolution of sins, which, whether given publicly or privately, is still a Sacrament: and a Sacrament could not admit of so much variety in its forms, if this variety was not in the power of particular Churches, and if it had ever been imagined that the substance of the Sacrament could be altered thereby. The proof of this is found in these Offices, where we see as well by the confession of the penitents, as by the questions which are asked them, that the business is the ordinary confession of sins. Let the third, tenth, eighteenth, and several other Orders of Service in Father Martene's Collection^e be consulted, and it will be seen clearly that they relate to the absolution of sins, and not to censures; and yet that the collects and prayers that are designed for the absolution, are very different in a great number of these different Orders, which are uniform only in what concerns the substance. That I may not lengthen this chapter unnecessarily, I am obliged to refer my reader to Father Martene's collection, and to that which Father Morin has annexed to his Treatise on Penance, which are in every one's hands.

But a still stronger proof that these Orders relate to this very Sacrament of Penance, and not to the remission of censures and interdicts, is that the same variety which is found in the forms of Penance, is met with in those of the other Sacraments. The prayer which accompanies the unctions in the Sacrament of Extreme Unction makes its form, according

^e De Antiquis Ecclesie Ritibus, tom. 2. [tom. 1. Ed. 1788.: lib. 1.] cap. 6. art. 7.

Objection.

Answer.

Other Sacraments.

Extreme Unction.

CHAP.
X.

to the Divines, who found their proof on that passage of St. James: †“And the prayer of faith shall save the sick.” But how much have these prayers varied in different Churches, and at different times? Doctor de Launoy, in his excellent Treatise on Extreme Unction, and Father Martene in his Ecclesiastical Rites, furnish us with the proofs of this, so that we need not go farther to seek them.

Greek
and Latin
forms.

We have seen already by comparing the Euchology with our Latin Orders of Service, that the prayer which accompanies the unctions is altogether different. According to Goar ‡, who herein follows Arcudius and some other Greek Divines, the form of Extreme Unction among the Greeks consists in this prayer which accompanies the unction, ^h *Pater sancte, animarum et corporum Medice*, [Holy Father, Physician of souls and bodies,] &c. But there is nothing in our ancient Latin Orders that exactly answers to this prayer, in which there is no mention made of the unction. It is very probable that we should not find much more uniformity amongst the other Oriental Churches, if the rites of which they make use in the administration of this Sacrament had been published. But since these are wanting, let us see if there be more uniformity among the Latins.

Latin
forms.

Our Divines suppose that the form of Extreme Unction consists in these words: *Per istam sanctam unctionem* [By this holy unction], &c. which is now used; or in this direct form more in use formerly, *Ungo te de oleo sancto* [I anoint thee with holy oil], &c. Yet how many Orders of Service do we find without these formulæ! In St. Gregory's Sacramentary we find the collects which accompany the administration of this Sacrament; but we see there neither the preceding forms, nor any mention of the unction in the prayers, which may be seen in M. de Launoy's Treatise, such as they were used before the interpolation of that Sacramentary. On the contrary, in several of the Orders published by M. Martene, these prayers are left to the will of the Minister, as a thing not at all belonging to the essence of the Sacrament.

The same Father Marteneⁱ has published an Order after

† James v. 15.

‡ Euchol. p. 437. [not. 29.]

^h De Ant. Eccl. Rit. tom. 2. p. 248.

[lib. 1. cap. 7. art. 4. ord. 33.: tom. 1.

p. 351. Ed. 1788.]

ⁱ Ibid. Ord. 6. [8.] tom. 2. p. 139.

[tom. 1. p. 311.]

the use of St. Germain des Prez, taken from the Sacramentary of St. Gregory, wherein there is express mention made of the unction. Yet the prayer which accompanies it, has no conformity with the preceding forms. In the ninth Order, taken from the Monastery of Moissac^k, the forms are still more different, and in nothing but the substance remain exactly the same.

I say nothing here of the difference between the indicative and the deprecatory forms; still less of the variety found in the choice and number of the prayers which are joined to the formulæ which accompany the unction. And yet this ought to be of some weight in the opinion of the most judicious Divines, who do not place the form of a Sacrament in certain words preferably to and exclusively of the other prayers which form a part of the Rite prescribed by the Church: for in this case, as the variety is much greater, we should have a still stronger demonstration of the power of particular Churches in the determination of forms, of which the variation would be much more visible.

But, independently of this view, which appears to me the truest and most reasonable, what I have already observed as to the form of Penance and that of Extreme Unction, is more than sufficient to convince us, that the variety is not confined to simple rites which accompany the principal formula, but that it is extended to the formula itself. We shall find still more variety in the form of Matrimony¹, nothing being so little uniform as the prayer which is joined to the benediction, and which properly constitutes its form. Thus, in the most ancient Offices we see no trace of the formula, *Ego vos conjungo* [I join you together], &c. which has since passed among our School Divines as the sole form of Matrimony: so certain is it that particular Churches have given themselves an entire liberty with regard to these forms, without any consequence ever having been drawn thence against the validity of these Sacraments.

This usage being so certain, the conclusion is easily drawn from it. Particular Churches have been in possession of a right to draw up for themselves a form for the administration

^k Ibid. Ord. 9. [11. (errato typographico, "V.")] tom. 2. p. 146. [tom. 1. p. 314.]

¹ Ibid. tom. 2. p. 614. et seq. [lib. 1. cap. 9. art. 5.: tom. 2. p. 127 et seq.]

CHAP.
X.

of the Sacraments; and even though this form agreed with the rest only in the substance, no one has thought for that reason that either the one or the other was invalid. The proof of this variety is in the Collections which have been published of ancient rites; and the proof of the validity of the Sacraments is in the mutual Communion which has been maintained, without any mention of reiteration. It has been always thought therefore that every Church, or at least every national Church, preserving the substance and spirit of the prayers which constitute the form of the Sacrament, has authority to alter them, enlarge them, abridge them, in a word, to use such order therein as she shall judge most convenient for the public edification, and her own benefit. The Church of England therefore has only made use of that power which she has in common with all other Churches, in giving to the rites of her Ordination the form she thought necessary, if in other respects she has preserved therein, as we have proved she has, all that can be thought essential.

Reason of
the case.
I. Disci-
pline.

This practice of particular Churches is moreover founded on reason. For, 1. It cannot be doubted that what is not determined either by the holy Scripture, or by the constant and universal practice of the Churches, or by an uncontested decision of an Œcumenical Council, belongs to discipline. But it is a maxim recognised in France, and regarded as the fundamental principle of our rights and liberties, that every Church is mistress of her own discipline; that even the authority of a General Council cannot oblige her to give it up, and that notwithstanding its decrees, she may continue in her own usages. It is upon this principle that in France we have always opposed the reception of the decrees of the Council of Trent on the subject of discipline, although in respect of doctrine, we receive it as a General Council. Besides, it is certain that in the case of the greater part of the Sacraments, their forms are determined neither by holy Scripture, nor by any decision of a Council, and still less by the constant and uniform practice of the Churches, amongst whom we have just remarked a great variety. This determination then belongs to discipline, and consequently is within the jurisdiction of the Churches, with whom this power cannot be contested, without depriving them of a right in favour of which they

they may always protest. The Church of England then had power to make some changes in the Ordination prayers, without any one's having a right to conclude thence that her Ordinations become invalid thereby.

But, it is said, though particular Churches have power to Objection. make some changes in their discipline, it is not true that they can exercise this right in respect of important articles, such as might be those of the celibacy of the Clergy, of the celebration *azymo aut fermentato* [in unleavened or leavened bread], of the forms of the Sacraments, &c. without rendering themselves guilty of schism, and exposing their Sacraments to becoming null; particular Churches having properly no right except over particular points of their own discipline, and not over important points which they have in common with all other Churches.

This objection is very plausible; but at the bottom what Answer. does it prove? That particular Churches must make no alterations of moment in articles of discipline which they have in common with the other Churches, without the consent of these same Churches, I grant. That they cannot do so without rendering themselves guilty of schism, this too is perhaps true. But that it follows thence that what they do is null, where is the consequence? and how will it be proved? Is it even quite true, that a particular Church cannot make important changes without proving herself schismatic? What? suppose the Church of France, for certain urgent reasons, which she alone may be acquainted with, should think it proper to restore, for example, the cup to the Laity, to resume her former Liturgy, to reform her Rites, and to recall them to their ancient simplicity, without breaking in her respects with foreign Churches; who would dare to charge us with schism? and ought not they rather to be regarded as schismatics, who should take occasion from such a change to separate themselves from us? But let us wave for a moment the question of schism; how will it be proved thence that the Sacrament which is administered is null? Such nullity can rest only on one of these two reasons; either that schism renders null all Sacraments administered out of the Church, or that the changes introduced by the schism affect the substance of the Sacraments. The first reason is false, and disavowed by all Catholic

CHAP. X. Divines. And the falsehood of the second has been demonstrated by making it as clear as the day, that the English preserved in their form all that has ever been reputed essential therein; since the changes which have therein been made are nothing else than a mere variety in the prayers, and since they have there preserved all the spirit of the ancient formulæ, and all the substance of what should be asked of God.

Objection. But allow, it is added, that particular Churches are mistresses of their discipline; that they may even make therein what changes they may think necessary; yet it cannot be concluded thence that they may make any alteration with respect to the forms, since Divines have never thought that the forms of Sacraments were a part of discipline, and since they have always regarded the matter and form of the Sacraments as things sacred, which neither individuals nor Churches were permitted to impair.

Answer. I do not pretend to examine here the common opinion of the Schools with regard to the pretended invariability of the matter and form of the Sacraments, which might perhaps be regarded as a mere chimera, after the facts which have been produced, and which is certainly disavowed by many Divines.

Boyvin. Amongst others Boyvin explains himself very fully on this head. For after having brought forward the difficulty taken from the variety found between the matter and form used by the Latins and by the Greeks, he answers it in these words. “^m Whence we must answer to this, that though both Churches

^m Unde ad hoc respondendum est, quod licet utraque Ecclesia non semper usa fuerit eadem materia et forma Ordinationis, imo nec Ecclesia Latina eandem semper adhibuerit, non minus tamen instituerit Christus materiam et formam omnium Ordinum; non quidem in specie, sed saltem in genere; præcipiendo Apostolis ut conferrent Ordines per aliquot verba et signa sensibilia,—licet reliquerit Ecclesiæ facultatem determinandi de talibus verbis ac signis. Quod mirum videri non debet, cum aliquid simile habeatur in Sacramentis Pœnitentiæ et Matrimonii.—Ratio autem cur talis mutatio materiæ et formæ Ecclesiæ concedatur circa hæc tria Sacramenta, et non circa alia, quæ omnimodam servant immutabilitatem, pendet ex

hoc, quod istorum materia Sacramentorum in aliquo morali consistat quod debet proinde subesse voluntati Ecclesiæ, quæ est omnium fidelium superior. —Hæc est responsio Doctorum Hallerii, Præpositi, Gamachæi, Isamberti, et aliorum, qui dicunt Ecclesiam Græcam et Latinam non variare materiam Ordinationis in ratione formali, sub qua illam instituit Christus, nempe in signo sensibili sumpto in communi; sed variare tantum materialiter hoc signum in particulari. Unde nil mirum est, si alio ritu sensibili utantur Græci, et alio Latini, imo si alio ritu alias usa sit Ecclesia Latina, et alio in hoc sæculo. *Theologia Quadripartita*, part. 2. [(*de Sacramentis*); cap. 11,] *de Ordine*, qu. 4. p. 242, 243.

have not always used the same matter and form of Ordination, and even the Latin Church herself has not kept always to one and the same, yet Christ instituted the matter and form of all Orders, not indeed particularly, but still in general; commanding His Apostles, that they should confer Orders by certain words and visible signs, . . . although he left the Church power to determine concerning such words and signs. Which ought not to seem wonderful, since somewhat of the same kind is found in the Sacraments of Penance and Matrimony. . . . But the reason why such change of the matter and form is allowed the Church in the case of these three Sacraments, and not of the rest, which remain altogether immutable, turns on this, that the matter of those Sacraments consists in something moral, which ought therefore to be subject to the will of the Church, which is over all the faithful.—This is the answer of the Doctors Hallerius, Præpositus, Gamachæus, Isambertus, and others, who affirm that the Greek and Latin Churches do not vary the matter of Ordination in the formal aspect, under which Christ instituted it, namely, in a sensible sign taken generally; but only materially vary this sign in particular. Whence it is nothing wonderful, if the Greeks use one sensible sign and the Latins use another, nor yet if the Latin Church herself has used one rite at a former time and another in this century.” We might, then, with many Divines, reject without scruple the invariability in question. But I am willing to be more yielding in the matter, provided that on the other side, they will be willing in turn not to dispute facts which are notorious and evident. But nothing is so notorious as the variety which is found in Churches with respect to forms. If then there is something in them which is unalterable, and which does not properly belong to discipline, it follows that we must distinguish with Cardinal Bona two things in the formsⁿ: that which is common to a Church with all the rest, and that which is peculiar to each. Taking this hypothesis, I grant that nothing which is common to all the Churches can be altered without destroying the Sacrament: but it must also be conceded me, that alterations made in things which have not been practised either at all times or in all places, cannot alter the substance of the Sacrament. In a word, that which always has

Divines
quoted
by him.

Cardinal
Bona.

ⁿ Rerum Liturgicarum lib. 1. cap. 6.

CHAP. X. been, and that which is every where, is invariable; for tradition is an infallible rule in this matter: but as to what is neither perpetual nor uniform, each Church may make therein the changes she thinks necessary, and the Sacraments which have been conferred with such changes cannot be reiterated.

The principle applied.

The application of this principle is very easy. In Ordination we see two things which are of all times and of all places: imposition of hands, and prayer to request of God to pour down his Spirit on the person receiving Ordination, and make him worthy to discharge all its functions. But the disposition of the prayers, their number, their composition, the ceremonies, and the particular rites which have been added thereto, have neither perpetuity, nor universality, nor uniformity, as Cardinal Bona observes with regard to the Eucharist: “^o But,” says he, “the mode and rite by which all things are performed, the words in which the prayers are conceived, the Order of the ceremonies, and the other things of less moment, are different in different Churches, and peculiar to this one or that; and have not been so instituted by the Apostles or Apostolical men, as to be perpetual and immutable.” Variations have taken place both with times and with places; and the same Churches have not always observed the same rites, as has been seen. But the Church of England has made no change in the first point, but only in the second, which belongs to a discipline very mutable, as has been shewn in the preceding chapters. She has changed nothing, then, but what she had a right to change, and consequently her Ordinations cannot be taxed with being invalid. This first argument, therefore, ought to pass for a demonstration in its kind.

II. Authority of the Church of Rome.

A second argument proper to prove the authority of a national Church to make the alterations she may think necessary in the forms of the Sacraments, so long as the substance is preserved, is this, that no Church, not even the Church of Rome, has any right to oblige other Churches to submit to her own particular discipline, as has been proved at large by the author of the new Treatise on the Authority

^o Modus autem et ritus quibus hæc omnia peraguntur, verba quibus preces concipiuntur, Ordo cæremoniarum, et reliqua minoris momenti, diversis Ecclesiis diversa et peccularia sunt; nec ita

ab Apostolis et ab Apostolicis viris instituta fuerunt, ut perpetua forent et immutabilia. *Ibid.* [§ 1. p. 34. Ed. Paris. 1672.]

of the Pope, printed at the Hague in 1720. In fact, jealous as the Popes have been to maintain their authority, the more prudent have been sufficiently moderate to leave particular Churches at liberty to regulate their own discipline, even when they were able to prescribe to them. This appears evidently by a letter of St. Gregory to Augustine the Monk, who being surprised that the Faith being the same in all the Churches, the practices were so different; asked for nothing better than to make England follow all the customs of the Church of Rome. “^p But it pleases me,” writes this great Pope to him, “that whatever you have found either in the Church of Rome, or in those of Gaul, or in any Church whatever, which may please Almighty God better, you would carefully select; and into the Church of England, which as yet is new in the faith, introduce by your instruction and care the most excellent things you have been able to collect from many Churches; for we must love, not things for places, but places for things. Out of each Church, therefore, choose those things which are pious, religious, right; and these collected as it were into a bundle, deposit in the minds of the English for their practice.” Thus, whatever presumption there is in favour of the Church of Rome, it has never been thought necessary to make a rule of submitting to her discipline and her laws; because each Church had both sufficient authority to make them, and sufficient wise and learned men to make such as were good, as is observed by the ancient author of the Book on the Sacraments attributed to St. Ambrose. “^q In all things,” says he, “I desire to follow the Church of Rome, but still we too have sense: therefore what is elsewhere more correctly preserved, we too more correctly keep.”

Letter of
St. Gre-
gory the
Great.

It is in consequence of this principle, that particular Churches have each its Liturgy and its Ritual sufficiently

Effects of
this princi-
ple.

^p Sed mihi placet, ut sive in Romana, sive in Galliarum, sive in qualibet Ecclesia, aliquid invenisti, quod plus Omnipotenti Deo possit placere, sollicite eligas; et in Anglorum Ecclesia, quæ adhuc in fide nova est, institutione præcipua quæ de multis Ecclesiis colligere potuisti, infundas. Non enim pro locis res, sed pro rebus loca nobis amanda sunt. Ex singulis ergo quibusque Ecclesiis quæ pia, quæ religiosa, quæ recta

sunt elige, et hæc quasi in fasciculum collecta, apud Anglorum mentes in consuetudinem deponere. *Greg. M. lib. 11. Ep. 64.* [resp. 3. Opp. tom. 2. col. 1152. Ed. Paris. 1705.]

^q In omnibus cupio sequi Ecclesiam Romanam; sed tamen et nos homines sensum habemus: ideo quod alibi rectius servatur, et nos rectius eustodimus. *Lib. 3. cap. 1. [§ 5. Opp. tom. 2. p. 363. Ed. Paris. 1690.]*

CHAP. different from its neighbour Churches. “^r In many things,”
 X. says Fulbert of Chartres, “Greece from Spain, and from them the Churches of Rome and France differ: but neither at this are we scandalized.” That they have often retained their particular customs, notwithstanding the efforts which have been made to induce them to abandon them; because, as Gerson observes, every country abounds in its own way of thinking: ^s *Qualibet Provincia in sensu suo abundat*. That the Church of Rome herself, in the drawing up of her offices, has profited by those of other Churches, according to Walafridus Strabo’s account: “^t And because the Church of France, being no less furnished with the most skilful men, had no small supply of sacred Offices, some parts of these are said to have been incorporated into the Offices of the Romans.” That even since the majority of the Western Churches, in compliance with their Princes, have adopted the Liturgy as well as the Rituals and Pontificals of Rome; they have not deprived themselves of the authority of making therein the changes they have thought necessary, because this right is without the bounds of prescription, and they have actually exercised it^u, as well in refusing to conform to the alterations which Rome had made in her Pontifical in 1645, as in restoring ancient usages which they had abandoned. And that, lastly, according to the maxim of St. Augustine^x, in things not determined by the Holy Scripture, the great rule is to follow the practice of each particular Church, with whom the right cannot be contested, of prescribing her own discipline, as far as to the most essential part of the Sacraments, as an ancient Author teaches us: “^y Hence it seems to be, that He (Christ) says, Do this in remembrance of Me.

^r In multis Græcia ab Hispania, ab illis Romana et Gallicana discrepat Ecclesia: sed neque in hoc scandalizatur. *Fulbert. Carnot. Ep. 2.* [V. ad p. 97.]

^s De Stat. Eccles. Edit. novis. p. 533. tom. 2.

^t Et quia Gallicana Ecclesia, viris non minus peritissimis instructa, sacrorum Officiorum instrumenta habebat non minima, ex eis aliqua Romanorum Officiis immixta dicuntur. *De Rebus Ecclesiasticis*, cap. 25. [In *Speculo Misæ*, Ven. 1672. p. 83.]

^u Nouv. Mem. du Clergé, t. 5. p. 472.

^x August. Ep. 54.

^y Hinc esse videtur quod ait (Christus) Hoc facite in Meam commemorationem. Non ait, hoc modo facite. . . . Unde nonnulla Christianæ Religionis instituta eum in Ecclesiæ nascentis initio suæ modum originis acceperere, quem in progressu ejusdem crescentis propter quasdam rationabiles causas non diu tenuere. *Ernulphus Roffens. Ep. 2.* tom. 2. Spicil. [In *Dacherii* (vel *D’Acherii*) *Spicilegio*, tom. 2. p. 433.]

He says not, Do it after this manner. Whence it happens that some institutions of the Christian Religion, were formed on that model in their origin in the first infancy of the Church, which as she advanced in growth they for certain reasonable causes did not long retain." But since no Church has a right to subject other Churches to her discipline; it follows naturally, that the Church of England, as the rest, had power to compose prayers for herself, to regulate the Liturgy, to order the forms of the Sacraments to her own satisfaction; in a word, to make what changes she chose, provided they were compatible with those essentials which are common to all Churches, and belong to all ages.

This second principle appears as solid as the former, and it does not seem that difficulties can be raised of sufficient ^{Difficulties.} importance to oblige us to abandon it. The only one which merits any attention is this: if the Church of Rome, it is said, has no authority to subject other Churches to her own discipline, we cannot at least contest with her that of obliging the particular Churches to observe the discipline long since established throughout the whole Church; and that if, for example, a Latin Church wished to celebrate [†the Eucharist] *in fermentato* [in leavened bread], she would have a right to stop her. It is agreed moreover that the discipline of Churches is very different: but it cannot be granted, that this variety can extend itself to the forms of the Sacraments, and that they are to be reputed a part of discipline, over which each Church may exercise its right.

It is not necessary to dwell long upon the refutation of this last reason, since we have already proved that this variety extends itself to all the forms of the Sacraments, at least to those that are not determined by Scripture; and that the arrangement and composition of the prayers, which constitute the form of the Sacraments, cannot be regarded otherwise than as making a part of discipline. The words of Cardinal Bona are express: *Verba quibus preces concipiuntur* [the words in which prayers are conceived]. Father Morin is still more distinct, as he leaves to the power of the Churches the determination of the forms. ^{Answer to the second.} ^z *Quare videtur omnino*

^z De adm. Sacram. Pœnit. lib. 8. c. 17. [§ 1. p. 566. Ed. Brux. 1685.]

CHAP. *dicendum istarum rerum determinationem esse definitioni Ecclesiarum permissam.* X. It is true that this same Father maintains afterwards that the matter and form of the Sacraments are unalterable ; but then he speaks only of their substance, and by no means of the terms of the forms, which have varied with times and places. “^a I again affirm, that neither so does the Latin differ as to substance from the Greek, . . . nor does it at all belong to the substance of the Sacrament, whether it be enounced indicatively or in the deprecatory form, if each person only follows the usage of his own Church.” But the determination of the words is no less indifferent, so far as the substance of the Sacraments is concerned, than the way of enouncing them, and all this, speaking generally, is comprised under what is accidental to the form; and moreover, the proofs we have adduced of the fact, will convince all reasonable persons, that the manner of drawing up the forms is a matter of mere discipline.

Answer to
the first
difficulty.

As to what they say that the Church of Rome has a power to oblige particular Churches to comply with the discipline long ago established throughout the whole Church, and to check them if they deviate from it, this is true to a certain degree, but it does not at all make against the maxim we have established. It is very true, that the Church of Rome has a general right of inspection over all particular Churches, and that in this character she is the depositary of the authority of the Church, to cause her laws and usages to be observed; that she ought to watch over the obedience due to the holy Canons, to prevent their being weakened or forgotten by inattention or relaxation, and to maintain with care and exactness all that may contribute to the preservation of divine worship, of morality, of discipline, of peace.

But that it follows from this power, that national Churches cannot make any change in important points of discipline when they think it necessary, and that the Church of Rome may hinder such changes on pain of nullity in the Sacraments in which these changes are made; this, it seems to me, is a thing impossible to prove. It was only in particular Pastors that the Council of Trent^b refused to acknowledge such a power.

^a Dico iterum, nec sic formam Latinam a Græca substantialiter differre,—nec ullo modo ad Sacramenti substantiam pertinere, indicative an depreca-

tive enuntietur, modo Ecclesiæ suæ ritum quisque sequatur. *Ibid.* c. 18. [§ 8. p. 570.]

^b Sess. 7. de Sacr. in gen. Can. 13.

And in fact, not to depart from the example alleged, of the consecration of the Eucharist performed by a Latin *in fermentato* [in leavened bread], and by a Greek *in azymo* [in unleavened bread], who will be persuaded that such a consecration is invalid? especially if it be supposed, as it ought, that this Latin or this Greek followed herein an alteration ordained by a whole province or nation of which he was a member? This is no metaphysical question. The Armenians^c and the Maronites among the Greeks have forsaken the use of leavened bread to adopt that of unleavened. Has their consecration ever been regarded as invalid for this? Or, if some blind and prejudiced writers among the Greeks have so decided, has not their decision been regarded by wise and enlightened divines as an error?

In vain would it be said that these two nations have herein only reunited themselves to the Catholic Church: for it is agreed among the Latins, that this usage being indifferent, every one ought to follow the practice of his own Church, and that it is no more lawful for a Greek to conform to the Latins, than for a Latin to conform to the Greeks. Thus the case is quite parallel. I agree in truth that both the one and the other would do wrongly. But to believe that on either side the Sacrament would be null, is what no rational Divines will agree to. They almost all decide the contrary, that a man would certainly sin in not conforming himself to the usage of his own Church, but that the consecration would be none the less valid. On this point may be consulted Estius, Sylvius, Suarez, Vasquez, Mærat, de Rhodes, Father Alexander, and many other Divines of different parties, who are agreed in the same opinion.

An objection answered.

But I say more. Even this, that the Church of Rome has always the right to oblige particular Churches to observe the discipline established in the rest of the Church,—even this is not absolutely true. If these particular Churches forsake the common practice, and the rule, by abuse, by relaxation, by negligence,—then, it is true, the Church of Rome may exercise her right of inspection and vigilance, for the preservation of discipline and of the holy Canons: but if important reasons

Limits to the power of Rome.

^c Cardinal Bona, *Rer. Liturg.* lib. 1. cap. 23. [§ 1. p. 198.]

CHAP. obliged these Churches to make alterations in considerable
 X. points of discipline, I do not see how the Church of Rome could oblige them to conform to the rest.

Difference
 between
 ought and
 can.

I am well aware that such changes as these ought not to be made without consulting other Churches, and still more the first of all Churches: but it is one thing to do what one ought, and another to do what one can. It would be doing wrong, I allow, not to wait for the consent of the Church of Rome, before making an important change: but this would not authorize that Church to annul all that should have been done without her consent, and to abrogate all that should have been enacted without her participation. If, for example, as the late M. Bossuet Bishop of Meaux wished^d, the Church of France should think it necessary to re-establish the Communion in both kinds, and that she actually did re-establish it without asking the consent of Rome; will any one easily be persuaded that that Church could oblige us to revoke such a re-establishment, and that if she separated from us for this reason, the schism would be more imputed to us than to her? There is certainly no reason for believing it; and every thing persuades us to the contrary, that in the case of such changes of discipline as take place with the consent of a whole Church and nation, the cause having been examined into, and for reasons which she judges grave and necessary, no other Church can oblige her to renounce such an alteration.

English
 changes
 not in es-
 sentials.

But be this as it may,—whether or not the Church of Rome has power to make particular Churches submit to the discipline universally established, it is enough for my present purpose, that this power which it is wished to secure to her, gives her no right to annul those Sacraments in which no alterations have been made except in things undetermined, and in which whatever has always been observed and regarded as essential in the Church has been preserved. But the alterations made in the English Rite of Ordination are precisely of this nature, as has been shewn at great length. So that even granting the right to condemn as unlawful the change which the Church of England made in the form of Ordination, this change would not for this reason render the Sacrament invalid. For, as Father Alexander has very well taught us, the Sacrament does not

Opinion of
 Father Ale-
 xander.

^d His letter is printed among the Proofs.

become invalid but when the sense of the form is destroyed. *ⁱ Additio verborum quæ debitum formæ Sacramentalis sensum corrumpunt, tollit veritatem Sacramenti; . . . Si vero ejusmodi additio fiat, quæ non auferat debitum sensum, non tollitur Sacramenti veritas.* This Doctor goes even farther; for he observes that even though the addition should have been made with the design of favouring error, provided it does not corrupt its essence, the Sacrament is quite valid. *Quamvis porro aliquid addatur contra fidei veritatem, si tamen formam non afficiat, nec in eam refundatur, aut ejus sensum variet, non tollit veritatem Sacramenti: . . . Quod autem preces hæresim continentés, non reddant irritum Sacramentum, cum formæ Sacramentali adjunguntur, nec eam tamen afficiunt et corrumpunt, docet S. Augustinus Lib. 6. De Baptismo contra Donatistas, Cap. 25.*

And lest it should be thought that he spoke here only of heretical additions inserted by inattention, or by fraud, he adds: “*ⁱ* If he added these words, not as wishing them to be a part of the Sacramental form, but in order to set forth his own error, or to draw others into the same heresy, the consecration would be true and valid, provided his intention was to do what the Church does.” But who would dare to maintain that the additions made in the English Rite corrupt the sense of the form, *debitum formæ Sacramentalis sensum*? He would be convicted of falsehood by the mere reading of the prayers of the Ritual, which perfectly contain the spirit of the Church in the Ordination of her Ministers.

A third reason which may be insisted on, is taken from the variations of the Church of Rome in her own formulæ, and from the corrections she has thought it right to make in her Rituals. As for the corrections, I desire no other authority for them, than the Bishop of Pianza, who in his Epistle addressed to Innocent the Eighth, at the head of his Edition of the Pontifical, printed at Rome in 1485, addresses him as follows: “*ⁱ* The emendation of the Pontifical, most blessed

III. Variations in the Roman formulæ.

ⁱ Natalis Alexander, Theol. Dogm. et Mor. lib. 2. cap. 3. reg. 6.

ⁱ Si adjungeret formæ hæc verba, . . . non quasi partem formæ Sacramentalis esse vellet, sed ut errorem suum indicaret, aut alios in eandem hæresim pertraheret, vera esset ac rata consecratio, modo intenderet facere quod facit Ecclesia.

ⁱ Pontificalis Libri emendationem, Beatissime Pater, tuo jussu aggressus sum: opus sane laboriosum, varium, atque ut multis fortasse gratum, ita et invidiæ plenum: rei enim vetustate, Ecclesiarum multitudine, temporum et Prælatorum varietate effectum est, ut vix duo aut tres codices invenian-

CHAP.
X.

Father, I have taken in hand according to your order: a work, in truth, which is laborious, of a various nature, and though to many perhaps agreeable, yet also abundantly invidious: for through the antiquity of the matter itself, the number of the Churches, the variety of prelates and times, it has come to pass, that hardly two or three books are found, which deliver the same thing. In like manner, the variations are as many as the books: this is deficient, that redundant; another has nothing at all on the subject; seldom or never do they agree." And as to the variations, they are so obvious, that they have embarrassed the greater part of our Divines. In the Sacraments of Penance, of Ordination, and of Marriage, the ancient Orders or Rituals contain nothing approaching to those formulæ to which the Divines of this day attach the idea of form. Neither the *Ego vos absolvo* [I absolve you], nor the *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum* [Receive the Holy Ghost], nor the *Ego vos conjungo* [I join you together], appear before the later centuries; and this is so evident, that some authors have used it as an argument, to prove that our Saviour did not determine in detail the forms of the Sacraments. "h This is the answer," says Boyvin in his Theology, "of the Doctors Hallerius, Præpositus, Gamachæus, Isambertus, and others, who say that the Greek and Latin Churches do not vary the matter of Ordination in the formal aspect, under which Christ instituted it, namely, in a sensible sign taken generally, but only materially vary this sign in particular. Whence it is nothing wonderful . . . if the Latin Church has used one rite at a former time, and another in this century."

Ancient
Sacra-
mental
Orders.

Inference. It follows necessarily from these corrections and variations, that particular Churches are not obliged to follow forms which the Church of Rome herself does not regard as essential. But forms which they alter and reform can never pass for essential forms to which they can subject the other Churches. It must

tur, qui idem tradant. Eodem modo quot libri, tot varietates; ille deficit, hic superabundat; alius nihil omnino de ea re habet; raro aut nunquam conveniunt. *Pontif. Rom.* Ed. Rom. 1485. [Et 1497.]

^h Hæc est responsio Doctorum Hallerii, Præpositi, Gamachæi, Isamberti, et aliorum, qui dicunt Ecclesiam Græcam et Latinam non variare mate-

riam Ordinationis in ratione formali, sub qua illam instituit Christus, nempe in signo sensibili sumpto in communi, sed variare tantum materialiter hoc signum in particulari. Unde nihil mirum est—si alio ritu alias usa sit Ecclesia Latina, et alio in hoc sæculo. *Theol. quadrip.* part. 2. *de Ordine*, qu. 4. p. 243. [See p. 162.]

therefore be regarded as certain, that every Church has a right against which there is no prescription, to regulate those forms which have not been determined by our Saviour.

A last reason, which gives still greater force to the three former, is that it appears certain from the ancient monuments, that there were neither Liturgies nor written formulæ for the administration of the Sacraments used in the Churches before the fifth century. This were easy to prove at large, but, in order not to lengthen this chapter needlessly, I had rather refer the reader to the Treatise on Liturgies by David Clarkson a learned Englishmanⁱ, and the excellent work of Father Le Brun on the Liturgies^k.

IV. No written formulæ at first.

But supposing the truth of this proposition, it necessarily follows thence, that each Church added to or retrenched her formulæ and prayers, without being tied to any thing but the substance and spirit of the prayer or formula, in which uniformity was easily kept by tradition, which preserved its sense, but which could not easily have transmitted its words, especially when these consisted in long prayers or long formulæ, which it was difficult to retain.

I know not whether a man can refuse to yield to the force and evidence of these reasons. Accordingly it is conceded readily enough that a particular Church may make alterations while she continues a part of the Catholic Church: but it is maintained at the same time that a heretical or schismatical Church loses by her schism or her heresy that power which has descended to all particular Churches which are members of the Church Catholic; because her rebellion against the Church disqualifies her to act in her name, while yet what she does can have no other validity, except as it is done in the name of the Catholic Church.

Conclusion.

Objection.

This reason is one of those which St. Cyprian urged most against Pope Stephen: but it must be allowed also, that if this argument were granted, it would annihilate every thing done out of the Church: and moreover, we may further oppose to this the possession of the heretical Churches, and their practice in composing their rites and forms, without any objection having been raised against the validity of their Sacraments. M. L'Abbé Renaudot is an unexceptionable

Answer.

ⁱ Sect. 4, 5, 6.

^k Tom. 2. diss. 1. p. 4 &c.

CHAP. X.
 Syriac Liturgies &c.

evidence of this usage. “¹ That James of Edessa,” says he, speaking of the Syriac Liturgies, “and others more modern were the authors of their own, there is no reason to doubt; for it was the discipline of the Jacobite Church, that the Bishops should have supreme authority in arranging the sacred Offices, and appointing the prayers; which authority, too, was much greater among the Syrians than among the Egyptians.” And lest it should be imagined that this power extended only to the less essential rites, the same author adds, that they have exercised this right with respect to the forms of Baptism, of Penance, and of Marriage, and even with respect to the Liturgies, which are the most august and sacred things we have in our Religion. “^m *Igitur ex Episcopali autoritate, qua Orientales Antistites usi sunt, in ordinandis Ecclesiasticis Officiis, ut Baptismi administrandi formulas, Ritualesque libros, cum adjunctis precibus, Coronationis seu Benedictionis nuptialis, Absolutionis Pœnitentium, et alia non pauca, ita quoque Liturgias scripserunt, —* [In pursuance therefore of that Episcopal authority which the Oriental High Priests have used in ordering Ecclesiastical Offices, as (they have drawn up) Forms for administering Baptism, and Rituals, with prayers annexed, for the nuptial Coronation or Benediction, for the Absolution of Penitents, with many other Offices, so also have they composed Liturgies.] This is also the opinion of Father Le Brun with regard to the Liturgies, as we shall see hereafter.

Armenian
 Eucharist.

The change which has taken place in the Armenian Church with respect to [†the celebration of the Eucharist with] unleavened bread, which she has adopted in opposition to all the Churches of the East since she suffered herself to be infected with the error of the Eutychians, is a further and an evident proof that heresy or schism does not deprive a Church of the power to make changes in the most important Rites, and that she does not lose by her schism any of her authority in this respect.

¹ Jacobum Edessenum et alios recentiores suarum auctores fuisse, non est cur dubitemus. Jacobiticæ quippe Ecclesiæ ea disciplina fuit, ut Episcopi summam in sacris Officiis disponendis precibusque ordinandis haberent auto-

ritatem; quæ etiam inter Syros major omnino quam inter Ægyptios fuit. *Liturg. Orient.* tom. 2. *Diss. de Syr.* [Melch. et Jac.] *Liturg.* p. xiii. [V. p. 155.]

^m Ibid.

Should any one venture to maintain, that we extend too far the power herein allowed to heretical Churches, and that it ought to be confined at most to the change of some ceremonies, or of some rites which have been annexed to the administration of the Sacraments, in order to render the service more solemn; it would be easy to refute this, as well by the mere setting forth of the alterations themselves, as by the impossibility of fixing the power of a heretical more than that of a Catholic Church on the point of the validity or invalidity of a Sacrament. So that we must of necessity have recourse to facts, to see how far the Oriental Sects have extended their authority on this point, and what has been thought of the validity of their Sacraments.

An objection answered.

Facts.

If there was any Sacrament in which there ought to have been little alteration in the form, it is that of the Eucharist; and yet it is not found to have been exempt from them in the heretical Churches, while notwithstanding the validity of their consecrations has never been contested.

The Eucharist.

I say nothing here of the variety of the Canon, which ought nevertheless to be of some weight and consequence with those who know that the Greeks and Orientals regard the Canon, or at least the invocation of the Holy Ghost which is therein contained, as an essential part of the consecration, and consequently as making a part of the form. But with respect even to the words of our Saviour, what variety is there in the Oriental Liturgies! Let the great Collection of M. L'Abbé Renaudot be consulted, and the proof of this will be seen.

The Canon.

Our Saviour's words.

In the Syriac Liturgy which bears the name of Matthew the Pastor, this form is expressed in the following manner: "This is My flesh, which is divided for all the faithful adhering to Me, that it may be eaten for the expiation of offences, &c. In like manner also the cup of life,—He + blessed, He + sanctified, and He + gave it also to those who were initiated in His mystery, and commended it to them, that of it

Variations.

ⁿ Hæc est caro Mea, quæ pro omnibus fidelibus Mihi adhærentibus dividitur, ut comedatur ad expiationem delictorum, &c. Similiter et calicem vite, — + benedixit, + sanctificavit, + dedit-

que etiam illum mysterio Suo initiatis, commendavitque illis ut ex eo omnes communicarent, quodque in eo salus bibentibus illum esset declaravit, &c. *Liturg. Orient.* tom. 2. p. 348.

CHAP. all might partake, and declared that therein was salvation to
 X. them that drank it, &c.”

In the Liturgy of Thomas of Hieraclea, the variety is still greater. “^o He (Christ) took bread and wine, He + blessed, He + sanctified, He brake, + and gave it to His Apostles, saying: Take, use, and thus do. And when ye shall have received this, believe and be assured, that ye eat My body and drink My blood, doing it in remembrance of My death until I come.”

The Liturgy of Dionysius Barsalibi supplies us with yet another proof of this variety. For speaking of our Saviour, it says, that when He was about to suffer death, “^p The bread which He took, He + blessed, He + sanctified, He + brake, and called it His holy body unto life eternal to them that received it. *Amen.* And the cup which He had mixed of wine and water, He blessed, and made it His precious blood to them that receive it unto everlasting life. *Amen.*”

There is yet a greater difference. For in the Liturgy which bears the name of St. Xystus^q, and in the second attributed to St. Peter^r, our Saviour’s words are scarcely read in any manuscript, these only being found: *Accipite et manducate*, [and *Accipite et bibite ex eo vos omnes,*] *in remissionem peccatorum, et vitam æternam.* [Take and eat, (and Take and drink ye all of this,) for the remission of sins, and everlasting life.]

Lesser variations.

After differences so essential in a form which all regard as determined by Christ Himself, it is unnecessary that I should dwell upon other alterations which may be regarded as less important, but which do not fail to deserve some attention. Such is that which is seen in the Ethiopic Liturgy, where the form is thus conceived: “^s This bread is My body, which is broken for you for the remission of sins.” Or that of the Alexandrian Liturgy of St. Gregory, where the form is ad-

^o Accipit (Christus) panem et vinum, benedixit +, sanctificavit +, fregit, + deditque Apostolis Suis dicens: Accipite, utimini, et ita facite. Et cum hoc acceperitis, credite et certi estote quod corpus Meum editis et sanguinem bibitis, in memoriam mortis Meæ facientes donec veniam. *Ibid.* p. 384.

^p Panem etiam quem accepit, + benedixit, + sanctificavit, + fregit, et corpus Suum sanctum vocavit eum, in vitam

æternam illis qui illud acciperent. *Amen.* Et calicem quem miscuerat vino et aqua, benedixit, et sanguinem Suum pretiosum perfecit, illis qui illum accipiunt in vitam æternam. *Amen. Ibid.* p. 450.

^{q r} [*Ibid.* p. 142. and 160.]

^s Hic panis est corpus Meum, quod pro vobis frangitur in remissionem peccatorum. *Ibid.* tom. 1. p. 517.

dressed to our Saviour Himself, after this manner; “^t Thou didst give thanks + Thou didst bless + Thou didst sanctify + Thou didst break, Thou didst give to Thy holy Disciples and Apostles, and didst say, Take, eat; This is My body, which is broken for you and for many for the remission of sins,—This is My blood of the New Testament, which is shed for you and for many &c.” I should not notice these latter variations, as being but little essential, if it were not important to remark that in forms determined by our Saviour, the least alterations are of more consequence than more considerable changes in those which have been left to the determination of the Church; and if people have not thought themselves bound to certain expressions, even when they found them set down in the Scripture, they must have thought they might give themselves much more liberty when the question was only of prayers and formulæ in which neither perpetuity, nor universality, nor uniformity is found.

But what is more important to point out, is that these alterations which appear so essential, have been made ^u by Sects separated from the Catholic Church; that the right of making the changes they have made has never been contested with them; and that their Consecration has never been regarded as null. The learned are agreed in fact, that these Sects were already separated from the Catholic Church when they drew up their Liturgies. “^x The heresy of the Nestorians and of the Eutychians,” says the learned Father Le Brun, “was another reason for writing the Liturgy, because they could not but fear lest they should alter it. From that time in fact the Catholics and the heretics vied with each other in writing them; and as both the one and the other carried them all over the world, nothing can serve better to shew the common origin of all the Liturgies before the

These changes made after separation.

^t Gratias egisti + benedixisti + sanctificasti + fregisti, dedisti sanctis Tuis Discipulis et Apostolis, dixistique: Accipite, edite; Hoc est corpus Meum, quod pro vobis et pro multis frangitur, et datur in remissionem peccatorum,—Hic est sanguis Meus Novi Testamenti, qui pro vobis et pro multis effunditur &c. *Ibid.* p. 104.

^u Bona, *Rerum Liturg.* l. i. c. 9.

^x L'hérésie des Nestoriens et des

Eutychiens fut un nouveau motif d'écrire la Liturgie, parce qu'on devoit craindre qu'ils ne l'altérassent. Dès lors, en effet, les Catholiques et les hérétiques les écrivirent à l'envi des uns et des autres; et comme les uns et les autres les ont portées dans tout le monde, rien ne peut mieux servir à montrer l'origine commune de toutes les Liturgies avant le Concile d'Ephèse. *Liturg.* tom. ii. n. 135.

CHAP.
X.

council of Ephesus." But even though this were not an agreed point, it would be enough to persuade one of it, to observe that the Liturgies did not begin, properly speaking, to be written before the time when these Sects arose; that the greater part bear the names of their authors, whom we recognise as Nestorians and Eutychians; that their little conformity with the Greek and Latin Liturgies proves evidently that they were not derived from them; that the errors of these Sects are often insinuated at least, if they do not always shew themselves openly; and that, in fine, besides the testimonies of the Learned, who do not dispute that these Liturgies belong to these Sects, the very corrections which they thought it right to make at Rome, prove sufficiently that they were not thought very orthodox, and that they needed to be reformed according to those which were regarded as the model of the rest.

Ordina-
tion.

If from the consecration of the Eucharist, we go on to the form of Ordination, we shall find as little uniformity between the Ordinations of the Greeks and Latins, and those of the Syrians (as well Nestorian as Eutychian) and Copts; and this without any one's having disputed the Ordination of all these Sects. As the most able Divines do not annex the efficacy of the Sacrament to any particular words exclusively of the rest, it can not be shewn wherein precisely diversity consists, if it be not in this, that the prayers are not the same, that the words joined to the imposition of hands are altogether different, that all the ceremonies even of the Ordination are not alike; and that, in short, there is no conformity, unless that in all the Rituals the grace of the Holy Spirit is invoked on the Bishop Elect, in order to make him worthy of his Ministry. Persons may consult these Rituals in the works of Father Morin and Father Martene, who have published them, in order to be satisfied for themselves that we must either allow no Ordination in these Churches, or else admit that notwithstanding their separation and schism, they have possessed and used the power of drawing up for themselves the rites and forms of their Sacraments, as I undertook to prove.

Date of
Rituals

In short, it cannot be doubted but that these Rituals were all posterior to the origin of those Sects for whose use they were drawn up. For, besides the reasons we have produced

in speaking of the consecration of the Eucharist, and which apply in part to the forms of Ordination, it is further certain, both by some names which are mentioned, and by the Rubrics, wherein Patriarchs, Metropolitans and Archbishops are spoken of; as well as by the very nature of the rites, already too much burdened to savour of the primitive simplicity, that these formulæ were drawn up by Sects who took no pains to preserve more than the substance of Ordination; that is to say, the invocation of the Holy Spirit, together with imposition of hands, as has been done in the Anglican Ritual.

There is every reason to believe, that what we have remarked with respect to the Eucharist and Ordination, would be found to be the case with respect to all the other Sacraments, if we had had communicated to us all the rites that are in use in all the Churches of the Christian world. For to judge of them by what we have of the Latin and Greek Churches, whether as to Matrimony, or as to any other Sacraments, we find constantly the same variety; and this variety proceeds only from the authority which each Church has always allowed herself of regulating her exterior worship, under which are comprehended the forms of the Sacraments, or rather the choice of the prayers and expressions proper for the form of each Sacrament.

It ought therefore to pass for certain, that national Churches, at least, have been in possession of the power of regulating what concerns the forms of the Sacraments, and of prescribing to themselves the formulæ and prayers which are to serve to that end; and that even heretical and schismatical Churches have made use of this right, without its having been disputed with them.

The proof of this usage is drawn from the facts we have produced; and to convince one's self that they have not been disturbed on this head, one need only bear in mind that whenever a reunion has been talked of between these Sects and the Church of Rome, no mention has ever been made of repeating their Ordinations, or of abrogating those particular Rituals of which they were in possession in the administration of the Sacraments.

It is true, that in the Liturgies of these Sects which have

CHAP.
X.

been published at Rome, there were considerable alterations made; but these alterations ought not to be imputed to the Church of Rome; and all intelligent Divines have regarded them as so many attempts of men but little enlightened, who not confining themselves to the correction of the errors peculiar to these Sects, have put their hands even to the most indifferent rites and those on which that Church had always left an entire liberty. We cannot therefore build on the changes made by the Roman censors in order to judge of the validity or invalidity of a form; experience making it certain, that they proposed to themselves no other principle in their corrections, than that of reducing the Oriental rites to as near an affinity as possible with those of the Church of Rome, without troubling themselves whether the former were valid or not.

Two consequences.

But from these two facts, which carry their own evidence with them, that is to say, from the possession in which particular Churches have been of the regulation of their own discipline, their worship, and the form of their Sacraments, and from their Sacraments not having been reputed invalid, there result two evident and necessary consequences. The first, that the exercise of a similar power ought not to have been contested with the Church of England. The second, that this power being founded in possession, and that the Church of England having made use of it only within the ordinary bounds, that is to say, preserving constantly what a perpetual and uniform tradition has transmitted upon this head, we cannot tax with invalidity the Ordinations made since the Schism.

Grounds.

First.

These two consequences are founded upon the most simple reasonings. For, 1. The Church of England cannot be denied a power allowed in the Churches of the East, whom we know to have been engaged in heresy and schism. But by the facts alleged, it is evident, that the Oriental Sects have exercised this right; that none of their Sacraments have been questioned; that they have not been disturbed in the practice and possession of forming their own worship and discipline, even when their opinions were condemned in the strongest manner. The same justice then is due to the English, since their case is similar, and it cannot be refused them without

condemning the example of those Churches who have acknowledged this right in the ancient Sects.

2. Since this right cannot be contested with the Church of England, it follows necessarily that her Ordinations are valid. For since, as has been proved, the succession is certain; since the alterations, which were made in the Formulary of Ordination relate only to things not essential; since they do not affect the substance of the Sacrament, and every Church has the right, and is in possession, of the determination of things of this kind; on what ground can we regard as invalid Ordinations which have been repeated only on the strength of false facts, reasonings of little solidity, and pretexts the most frivolous and the most unreasonable in the world?

To these two consequences (which unite all the use which can be made of the facts before adduced) are opposed two difficulties, which it is to the purpose to discuss before finishing this chapter. First it is advanced, that it cannot be proved that the Liturgies, or the forms of the Sacraments, were drawn up by schismatical Churches; or at least, that those which they drew up were not the same with those which existed before in their Churches. But supposing even that schismatical Churches had composed their Liturgies, or the forms of their Sacraments, it is maintained that these facts do not establish a right in favour of these Churches; that all that they do they do unlawfully, because they retain no longer either jurisdiction or authority; and that therefore from what they have done we can by no means conclude that they had a right to do it. This is all that can be speciously objected: but the specious is not enough for those who seriously search after the truth.

In fact, as to the first difficulty, it is entirely false, that it cannot be proved that schismatical Churches have drawn up their Liturgies and the forms of the other Sacraments, or that they did not preserve those which were used before their heresy or their schism. For though the Liturgies, and the detail of the ancient formulæ which served for the administration of the Sacraments, have not been preserved to us, nevertheless the names of their authors, which they carry with them, the errors they have introduced into them, the great di-

CHAP.
X.

versity found among several Liturgies of Churches not distant from each other, the alterations which have successively been made in them, and even the acknowledgment of the learned, who allow that the Oriental Bishops have used a great liberty in the composition of their Liturgies, and that they were not written until after the origin of the heresies; are not these so many proofs either that these Churches drew up themselves the forms of their Sacraments, or that they did not use entire those which were in use before their schism and the birth of their errors? It is false then, that we cannot prove the composition or alteration of the Liturgies or forms by schismatical Sects; and since this can be proved, it is clear that there is now no more ground to dispute the validity of the English Ordinations, than there would be to deny the validity of the Sacraments conferred in these ancient Sects; and that the same reasons which assure to these Churches the validity of their Liturgies, and of their forms, authorize the rest to make similar alterations in things which not having been determined by our Saviour, are susceptible of change.

Second
explained.

But these facts, it is said, do not establish a right; and from what these Churches have done, we must not conclude that they had a right to act as they did. A poor equivocation, to unravel which, is sufficient to destroy the difficulty. It is an abuse of the word right: as if we pretended to acknowledge that what is done in an heretical or schismatical Church is done legitimately; whereas, we have declared in several places in this Treatise, that what is done by a schismatical Church is illicitly and illegitimately done, as St. Augustine says. When therefore we say, that these Churches retain the right to make the changes they judge convenient or necessary, we mean nothing more than that it is in such sort in their power to vary in things not clearly determined either by Scripture or uniform tradition, that the changes which they may prescribe, although made contrary to order and subordination, and consequently in an illicit and illegitimate manner, yet do not at all alter the validity of the Sacraments in which alterations of this kind are made.

But this right understood in this sense, and supposed through the whole course of this Dissertation, what becomes of the difficulty they oppose? From what has been done, we

cannot, it is said, conclude that they had a right to do it. This is true, if by right, is meant simply a legitimate right, and if we wished to conclude that what was done, was done lawfully. But if we thence conclude simply, that since no objection was raised against what was done, and since those Sacraments have been allowed as valid which were conferred in heresy and according to forms drawn up in schism, it follows that these Churches had the right to draw up or vary their Liturgies and their forms, without the Sacraments being for this reason the less valid; this conclusion is just, and we conclude invincibly from the fact to the right. But such exactly is the point at which we have aimed in this chapter, as one may see by these words, which are at the beginning of it, which fully express its whole object. *It remains to prove, that the Church of England, in making the changes she did, did only what the other Churches have done, and that nothing can be concluded thence against the validity of the English Ordinations since the Schism.*

It may perhaps be said, that the question is here of the same power which is allowed to national Catholic Churches: that with regard to these we have undertaken to prove not only that what they do is valid, but further that it is legitimate; and hence that as we have wished to assure to the schismatical Churches the same power with those that are Catholic, it follows, that the right allowed them assures them not merely of the validity of their Ordinations, but also of the legitimacy, if I may be permitted so to express myself, of all their variations in the matter of discipline. Objection.

To this the answer is easy, that if we have compared with Catholic Churches, it has always been with the necessary reserves, and that we have never pretended to enquire what either the one or the other could do legitimately, but only what they could do validly. This is so true even with respect to the Catholic Churches, that it is allowed in several places of this chapter, that there are many alterations which they could not make legitimately, without rendering themselves guilty of schism, and without destroying the subordination which the Churches owe one to another, and especially the inferiors to the superiors. The question, then, has been only of the validity of the Sacraments; and the position reduced Answer.

CHAP. X. to these terms labours under no difficulty; the facts and the reasons concur alike to prove, that the changes which are made in the forms of the Sacraments, cannot render them null, at least when the substance is not altered; and that there is no essential alteration in those wherein there is still retained what is determined by Scripture, or by a certain and uniform tradition, whatever alterations are made in the rites which have been added. This is clear by the conduct observed with regard to the Baptism administered by the English, or by the pure Calvinists. The whole form has been altered therein, excepting the invocation of the Holy Trinity: the prayers, the unctions, the exorcisms, every thing has been either changed or suppressed: their Baptism is nevertheless received. And why these different weights and measures as to their Ordination?

Another
objection
met.

We cannot certainly confine more than I do the power of Churches, even when schismatic, without contradicting venerable antiquity. But although it should be proved that I give too great a latitude to this power, what could be concluded thence against the validity of the Ordinations made out of the Church? It is agreed, that it is not by the legitimate jurisdiction of the Churches that we must judge of the validity or invalidity of the Sacraments, but by the preservation or suppression of what has always been regarded as essential; that [as for] the changes which affect only the ceremonies which have been added merely for the sake of solemnity, [they] may be retrenched with the same facility, so far as regards the validity alone; that it is on this ground that the validity of Baptism and the other Sacraments has been judged of, when heresies and schisms have arisen in the Church; and that, in short, of what nature soever the power attached to the sacramental stamp in the Societies separated from the Church may be, they preserve enough of it to administer the Sacraments with validity, when the essential matter and form are found in them.

Conclu-
sion.

These concessions are more than sufficient to terminate our whole dispute. For, in two words, since the validity or invalidity of a Sacrament depends upon the preservation or omission of what is essential in its matter and form, it follows, that if the Church of England has preserved what

is essential to Ordination, the Consecration of her Bishops is valid. But it has been clearly proved, that with respect both to the matter and to the form, all that is essential was therein preserved. Persons are therefore wrong in wishing to insist on the want of power in that Church, in order to destroy her Ordinations; since even if it had been proved that she had not a power of which so many other Sects have been in possession, it would be necessary to prove further that she has corrupted the matter and form of this Sacrament; which we have shewn to be false.

CHAP. XI.

ANSWER TO THE FOURTH DIFFICULTY. IT WAS NOT BY THE SECULAR, BUT BY THE ECCLESIASTICAL AUTHORITY, THAT THE ENGLISH RITUAL WAS ALTERED.

THOSE who are the greatest opposers of the validity of the English Ordinations, have hardly touched this difficulty,—^{Observation.} whether because they thought it foreign to our question, or because they saw clearly that it would not be easy to make use and take advantage of it against the Church of England. But in order not to leave any thing unanswered in a matter so important, I have thought it to the purpose to examine with some attention a difficulty which is not so foreign to this subject, but that one may draw from it consequences sufficiently connected with the principal question.

They grant us then, if it is wished, that a Church is mistress ^{Objection.} of her own discipline, and that she may make therein such alterations as she thinks convenient; but they maintain that a change made by the authority of the Prince in things which may affect the essence of the Sacraments, renders them altogether null. But it is said, if we consult the contemporary writers, and the public Records of the English Reformation, it is impossible to doubt that the change of the Ritual was brought about by the secular power. Hence the authority of the new Ritual being founded only on that of the King, who approved it, it cannot be said that it was the Church of England that changed her ancient usages, but must be granted that, the change having been made by a secular power, which cannot

CHAP. XI. of itself give any authority to the things it prescribes in spiritual matters, all that is done in consequence, ought to be accounted null; and all those Ordinations which have no other source and principle than this, are null from the beginning, and absolutely invalid.

Answer. But in order to give this objection any weight, they should have begun by establishing the truth of the fact, and this is a thing which it is impossible to do. For it is clear from all the English writers, and from the Acts of Parliament, that the King and Parliament had no other part in this affair, than that of ordering the reformation of the Roman Pontifical, of appointing the Bishops to this function, and of sealing with their authority the alterations which the Bishops and Divines judged necessary.

Heylin. This is what we learn from several authors, and among others from Dr. Heylin, from Burnet, and from Collier. “There passed,” says Heylin^a, in this Parliament (viz. in the Parliament of 1549) “two Acts of especial consequence—“ to the concernments of Religion. The first declared to this “effect: That such Form and manner of making and consecrating Archbishops and Bishops, Priests, Deacons, and “other Ministers of the Church, as by six Prelates, and six “other learned men of this Realm, learned in God’s Law, “by the King to be appointed and assigned, or by the most “number of them, shall be devised for that purpose, and set “forth under the Great Seal, before the first of April next “coming, shall be lawfully exercised and used, and no other.”

Burnet. Burnet agrees in this point with Dr. Heylin: ^b“So now,” says he, “the Reformation was ordered to be carried on; and there being one part of the divine Offices not yet reformed, that is, concerning the giving Orders, some Bishops and Divines, brought now together by a Session of Parliament, were appointed to prepare a Book of Ordination.”—^c“A bill for the Form of ordaining Ministers was brought into the House of Lords, and was agreed to, the Bishops of Duresme, Carlisle, Worcester, Chichester, and Westminster protesting against it. The substance of it was, that such Forms of ordaining Ministers as should be set forth by the advice of six Prelates and six Divines, to be named by the King, and authorized by a

^a Hist. Ref. p. 82.

^b Hist. Ref. vol. ii. p. 140.

^c Ibid. p. 141.

warrant under the Great Seal, should be used after April next, and no other.”

Collier, in his Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain, re- Collier.
lates exactly the same thing^d, and transcribes in full the Act of Parliament of which Heylin has given the substance; by which we perceive clearly that this new Formulary was drawn up by Bishops and Divines, and not by any secular authority. For, if we follow Heylin^e, the Bishops were Cranmer Archbishop of Canterbury, Goodrick Bishop of Ely, Holbeck Bishop of Lincoln, Day Bishop of Chichester, Skip Bishop of Hereford, Thirlby Bishop of Westminster, and Ridley Bishop of Rochester; and the Doctors were Richard Cox, May, Taylor, Heynes, Robertson, and Ridley, or rather, according to Burnet^f, Redmayn; and there is no mention made of any layman being concerned in that affair. What is more, the King and Parliament looked upon the execution of this order as a thing so foreign to their jurisdiction, that the Act which directed the revision of the book of Authority allowed the Bishops.
Ordination, was to take effect immediately upon its being approved by the Bishops, without any further necessity of presenting it to the Parliament, and having a new Act to order it to be used and observed, as we are informed by Dr. Heylin. ^g “They,” says this author, viz. the Bishops and learned men appointed to draw up the Form of Ordination prescribed by the Parliament, “accordingly applied themselves unto the work, following therein the rules of the primitive Church,—Which book, being finished, was made use of,” so corrected, “without further authority, till the year 1552.”

In fact, the first Act declared expressly that to introduce the use of this new Formula of Ordination, there should be no necessity for a new Act, and that that Act itself should suffice. ^h *Be it therefore enacted*, says this Statute,—*that such Form and manner of making and consecrating of Archbishops, Bishops, Priests, Deacons, and other Ministers of the Church, as by six Prelates, and six other men of this Realm, learned in God's Law, by the King's Majesty to be appointed and assigned, or by the most number of them, shall be devised for that purpose, and* Words of the Act.

^d Collier, Eccl. Hist. vol. ii. p. 288.

^e Heylin, Hist. Ref. p. 58. [compare p. 82, 83.]

^f Burnet, Hist. Ref. vol. ii. p. 61.

^g Heylin, Hist. Ref. p. 83.

^h Collier, Eccl. Hist. vol. ii. p. 288.

CHAP. *set forth under the Great Seal of England, before the first day*
 —XI.— *of April next coming, shall by virtue of this present Act be*
lawfully exercised and used, and none other.

Inference. Is not this a convincing proof, that this work was the work of the Clergy? that the secular authority did not interfere in the matter except for the external maintenance of that of the Church? that the King did not intrude into a function, which belongs absolutely to the Bishops? that such is the practice of the greater part of Churches, whose Ordinances do not take effect except so far as the Prince supports them by his regal authority? and, that if the King, in directing this reformation, exceeded the bounds of his power, the execution of the order had nothing but what was legitimate in the manner of proceeding?

Objection.
 Spiritual
 power
 granted
 the King.

To elude the force of all these testimonies, it is said that all this was done by the secular authority; that the Bishops were merely the executors of the orders of the King and Parliament; that their determinations were of force only so far as the King made them so by enjoining the observation of the new Ritual; and that, in short, the title of Head of the Church given to the King, with all the rights which any spiritual Power ever had over Ecclesiastical persons and things, to establish or to reform all that was necessary in the Church, proves evidently that the ministry of the Bishops was here only a matter of form, and that nothing had force except in virtue of the Prince's authority, and by his order,—as is proved by the Act of Parliament of the year 1535, which declares,
ⁱ “that the King—his heirs and successors,—shall be—re-
 “puted the only Supreme Head in earth of the Church of
 “England,—(2.) And shall have and enjoy,—all honours, dig-
 “nities, preeminences, jurisdictions, privileges, authorities,
 “immunities, profits and commodities to the said dignity—be-
 “longing and appertaining; (3.) And—shall have full power
 “and authority from time to time to visit, repress, redress,
 “reform,—all such errors, heresies, abuses, offences,—which
 “by any manner spiritual authority or jurisdiction ought or
 “may lawfully be reformed,” &c. This Statute was renewed
¹ El. c. 1. by the first Parliament held under Elizabeth¹ in the first year of her reign, and laid the foundation of all her conduct and of

ⁱ Statutes at Large, vol. i. p. 436.

^j Ib. p. 759.

that of her successors, with respect to Ecclesiastical affairs. But it is clear by this Statute, that the whole spiritual authority is made over to the King, that it is in him that it rests as its source, and that being substituted for every other spiritual power, he is accounted to have a right to exercise its functions, and to communicate to others the power of which he has the fulness, as Sovereign Head of the Church of England, as well in spiritual as temporal matters.

This power which the Parliaments have granted to the Kings of England has moreover not remained unused. We find, Use made of this power. it is said, in the documents published by Burnet, Commissions given by the Prince for the visitation of Churches, and these Commissions sometimes executed by mere laymen. We find Ordinances made in matters purely spiritual. We see powers given to preach and to administer, and also revocations of these powers. In a word, these Princes have united in their own persons both the regal and the sacerdotal authority, and have usurped a power which Princes had never enjoyed before them, and which had been thought incompatible, the one with the other, since the publication of the Gospel.

This, without doubt, is what may be said with the greatest Answer. force against the authority of the new Bishops, who have not, as is pretended, any other mission than that of the Prince. Our business is to inform ourselves of the truth of the fact. I agree in the first place with some English Divines, as Archbishop Bramhall^k and several others, that the power of the Kings of England has been too far extended in spiritual matters; that the title of Head of the Church of England in things spiritual and temporal, has in it something odious, and even scandalous; that such a title is a thing unheard of in the Church; and that it was impossible without prevarication and schism, to attribute to him all the rights, privileges and jurisdictions that ever appertained to any spiritual Power. Concession. An avowal like this ought to leave no suspicion that I approve, in any degree, the change made in this respect in the Church of England.

From all this does it follow that in England, the King is regarded as the source of spiritual power? as able to exercise What is denied. by himself the Ecclesiastical functions, and as substituted in

^k Works, p. 337.

CHAP.
XI.

all things for the right of the spiritual Powers, from whose jurisdiction they wished to withdraw themselves? These are so many consequences disavowed by the English Divines, and we must add by the Kings themselves, and by all the Clergy.

Proofs.
Art. 37.

In 1562, the Bishops assembled at London, drew up some articles in their Convocation, which they thought necessary for establishing uniformity of faith and discipline in their Churches; and we shall see what is said in the 37th Article¹. “Where we attribute to the Queen’s Majesty the chief government, by which titles we understand the minds of some dangerous folks to be offended; we give not our Princes the ministering either of God’s Word, or of the Sacraments, the which thing the Injunctions also set forth by Elizabeth our Queen do most plainly testify; but that only prerogative which we see to have been given always to all godly Princes in Holy Scriptures by God Himself; that is, that they should rule all estates and degrees committed to their charge by God, whether they be Ecclesiastical or Temporal, and restrain with the civil sword the stubborn and evil doers.” Two years afterwards, this article was ratified by the Convocation of the Province of York, and was thus allowed by the whole Nation. It was confirmed anew in 1571 by the Clergy, and authorized by the consent of the Queen, who thereby limited her own power to those functions which were purely external, for the maintenance of the Ecclesiastical discipline.

Canon 2
of 1603.

In 1603, a new Convocation of the whole Province of Canterbury was held at London, and this Convocation was approved and ratified by James the First. The second Canon treats of the King’s Supremacy in the Church of England; but there is no mention of any spiritual function which the Prince could exercise. ^m“Whosoever shall hereafter affirm, that the King’s Majesty hath not the same authority in causes Ecclesiastical, that the godly Kings had amongst the Jews, and Christian Emperors of the primitive Church; or impeach any part of his regal Supremacy in the said causes restored to the Crown, and by the laws of this Realm therein established; let him be excommunicated *ipso facto*”. In the Convocation

¹ [+Sparrow’s] Collection of Articles, &c. [p. 106: in the Latin,] p. 221.

^m Ibid: [in the Latin,] p. 272.

of 1640, held under Charles the Firstⁿ, wherein is explained the extent of the King's power as to what regards the Church, the whole consists in subjecting to him the Ecclesiastical Persons, in excluding the submission to any Foreign Power, that is to say to the Pope; in giving him the power of assembling and dissolving the Councils, and of using the civil sword, that is to say, his external power in retaining the Ecclesiastics, as well as the rest, in duty and submission.

Queen Elizabeth in her Injunctions of the year 1559^o had herself disavowed all the spiritual power attributed to her, to confine herself to preventing the recognition in her kingdom of any other independent authority in things spiritual. For she there declared, that by the Oath of Supremacy she pretended not to assume to herself any power or authority in the exercise of the Ecclesiastical Ministry, but required only that her subjects should acknowledge that she had sovereign authority over all persons, as well Ecclesiastics as Laics, within her Realm, and that no foreign Power had any authority over them. For see how she is there made to speak: Queen's Injunctions.

“ The Queen's Majesty being informed, that in certain places
 “ of the Realm, sundry of her native subjects, being called to
 “ Ecclesiastical Ministry of the Church, be by sinister persua-
 “ sion and perverse construction, induced to find some scruple
 “ in the form of an Oath, which by an Act of the last
 “ Parliament is prescribed—her Majesty forbiddeth all man-
 “ ner her subjects to give ear or credit to such perverse
 “ and malicious persons, which most sinisterly and maliciously
 “ labour to notify to her loving subjects, how by the words of
 “ the said Oath it may be collected, that the Kings or
 “ Queens of this Realm—may challenge authority and power
 “ of Ministry of divine Service in the Church,—her Majesty
 “ neither doth, nor ever will challenge any authority, than that
 “ was challenged and lately used by the said noble Kings of
 “ famous memory, King Henry the Eighth and King Edward
 “ the Sixth, which is, and was of ancient time due to the
 “ Imperial Crown of this Realm, that is, under God, to have
 “ the sovereignty and rule over all manner of Persons born
 “ within these her Realms,—of what estate, either Ecclesiastical
 “ or temporal, soever they be, so as no other foreign Power

ⁿ Ibid. p. 346.

^o Ibid. p. 83.

CHAP. “shall or ought to have any superiority over them. And if
 XI. “any—shall accept the same Oath with this interpretation,—
 “her Majesty is well pleased to accept every such in that behalf,
 “as her good and obedient subjects, and shall acquit them of
 “all manner of penalties contained in the said Act,” &c.

Apology of James I. James the First went yet further; as both in his Apology for the Oath of Allegiance, and in his Premonition to the Princes, he declared that he did not pretend to assume to himself by that Oath any other than a superiority in matters civil and temporal. ^p “I thought good to set forth an Apology for the said Oath: wherein I proved, that as this Oath contained nothing but matter of civil and temporal obedience, due by subjects to their Sovereign Prince, so &c.” This is what he repeats in several other places, and what proves clearly that nothing is less true than the attributing of spiritual power to the Kings of England. It is true that the Acts of Parliament of 1535 and of 1559 seem to give the King somewhat more; but since the Clergy and the Kings themselves restrain their sense, and acknowledge that these Acts mean no more than to declare, that the King has a supreme authority over the Ecclesiastics of his Kingdom as well as over others, and that the subjects of his Realm ought not to submit to any other Power; it is an injustice to press their terms rigorously, and not abide by the sense put upon them by their proper interpreters. For this interpretation has been so fully regarded as the only sense of the law, that the English Divines have not otherwise explained the Supremacy of the King, and his authority in matters Ecclesiastical and spiritual, than in subjecting all Ecclesiastical Persons to him, exclusive of any other Power, and making him to employ his power in the maintenance of the doctrine and discipline of the Church.

Statutes restrained.

Mocket.

“^q Now this regal authority in the Anglican Church,” says the

^p Works of James I. [Prem.] p.292.

^q Jam hæc regia potestas—in Ecclesia Anglicana usitate nominatur Ecclesiastica, non quod proximus ejus finis, seu immediatus effectus, sacer sit et spiritualis, cum peculiaris Presbyterorum prærogativa sit divini verbi et sacramentorum ministerio penetrare in hominum animas, illasque spiritu co-operante sanctificare: neque Ecclesiastica est ratione modi secundum quem circa res

sacras occupatur; illas enim minime præstat sartas tectas, de iis concionando, eas propriis manibus fideli populo distribuendo, excommunicationis sententiam, tanquam clavium potestatem habens, pronuntiando; sed hanc tantum decernendo (sicut Theodosius junior et Valentinianus in Codice Justiniano sanxerunt ut Nestoriani anathematizentur) et externa pœnarum civilium vi profanos hujus censuræ et istarum

author of the Polity of the Church of England, “is commonly called Ecclesiastical, not because its proximate end or immediate effect is spiritual, for it is the prerogative of Priests by the Ministry of the word and Sacraments to penetrate into the consciences of men, and sanctify them by the co-operation of the Holy Ghost; neither is it Ecclesiastical in respect of the manner in which it is exercised about holy things; for it by no means keeps these in repair by preaching concerning them, by administering them with its own hands to the faithful, by pronouncing the sentence of excommunication, as though it had the power of the Keys, but only by decreeing this, (as Theodosius the younger and Valentinian in the Justinian Code ordained that the Nestorians should be anathematized), and restraining by the external force of civil penalties the profane invaders of this censure and of these things.” So much for what relates to the King’s authority: but as regards the Supremacy, let us see in what the same author makes it to consist. “^rThe Church of England acknowledges a supreme authority, by which she by no means understands the power of determining at pleasure concerning persons and causes Ecclesiastical, but a pre-eminence over all Magistrates, within its own dominions, free from all compulsion of temporal punishments, and in this respect subject to God alone.”

The learned Mason, in his Defence of the Church of Eng-^{Mason.} land, gives the King no other power than that of which we have just spoken. “^sThe external government alone,” says he, “is committed by God to the King; the administration of the word and Sacraments is given—from heaven not to Kings, but to Priests.” This is what he again explains still more precisely, when he says that the King’s jurisdiction does not consist in the exercise of any Ecclesiastical or sacerdotal function, but simply in the authority to pass laws for the external policy, and to see that they are observed. “^t*Jurisdictio*

rerum violatores coercendo. *Polit. Eccl. Angl.* cap. 3. p. 24, 25.

^r *Authoritatem agnoscit Anglicana Ecclesia Supremam, qua potestatem ut statuat de personis et causis Ecclesiasticis pro suo arbitratu minime intelligit, sed infra suas ditiones præminentiam super omnes Magistratus ab omni tempora-*

lium pœnarum coactione liberam, solique Deo hac ratione subditam. Ib. p. 13.

^s *Externum duntaxat regimen Regi a Deo est demandatum; verbi et Sacramentorum administratio non Regibus, sed Sacerdotibus—cœlitus est concessa. Vind. Eccl. Angl.* lib. 4. cap. 2. p. 429.

^t *Ibid.* c. 1. p. 420.

C H A P. *Regia non sita est in potestate aliqua sacerdotali, aut in personali*
 XI. *alicujus Ecclesiasticæ functionis administratione, sed in auctori-*

tate quadam externa, suprema illa quidem, quæ in imperando cernitur, quæque delinquentes pœnis civilibus externe coerçet. It is in this sense that he says again that the Supremacy and jurisdiction attributed to the King is Ecclesiastical objectively only, and not formally; because he cannot exercise any spiritual function himself, but only direct and maintain the doctrine and discipline by his laws, and see that their functions are performed by the Ecclesiastics. “^u It is not lawful for Christian Princes to administer the word and Sacraments, to ordain, to excommunicate; but it belongs to them as supreme governors of all persons in all causes within their dominions, to order and take care, in virtue of their royal authority, that all these things are administered by such persons as the Lord has appointed to execute these holy offices,” “^x The power of the Prince, his jurisdiction or government in spiritual affairs, is spiritual only objectively, not formally . . . because it is not employed with regard to this object in a spiritual manner, that is in preaching, or administering the Sacraments; but in a civil one, that is, by establishing laws; neither does he restrain delinquents by the spiritual sword of excommunication, but only by the civil and material sword.”

Bramhall. Archbishop Bramhall expresses himself yet more clearly. “The Kings of England,” says he ^y, “are indeed in our laws called The Supreme Heads of the Church within their dominions, but how? Not spiritual heads, nor yet Ecclesiastical heads; so as S. N. need not fear our deriving our Orders from them; but civil heads by an influence of coercive or corroboratory power, by applying or substracting the matter, by regulating the exercise, by punishing the delinquencies of Ecclesiastical judges; that is, as much as to say, as supreme

^u Christianis Regibus verbum et Sacramenta administrare, ordinare, excommunicare fas non est; ad eosdem tamen, tanquam ad supremos omnium personarum in omnibus causis intra suas ditiones gubernatores, spectat auctoritate regia jubere et curare ut hæc omnia a talibus personis administrantur, quales ad hæc sacra munera obœnda designavit Dominus, . . . *Ibid.*

^x Principis potestas, jurisdictio, vel

gubernatio in rebus spiritualibus, est spiritualis objective tantum, non formaliter: . . . quia non versatur circa hoc objectum modo spirituali, id est prædicando, vel Sacramenta ministrando, sed civili, nempe leges sanciendo; neque delinquentes coerçet gladio excommunicationis spirituali, sed tantum civili et materiali. *Ibid.* c. 2. p. 433.

^y Works, p. 1001.

governors, as Saul is called The head of the tribes of Israel, yea of the tribe of Levi amongst the rest, &c.” “Neither do we draw,” says he elsewhere^z, “or derive any spiritual jurisdiction from the Crown; but either liberty and power to exercise actually and lawfully, upon the subjects of the Crown, that habitual jurisdiction which we received at our Ordination; or . . . In sum, we hold our benefices from the King, but our offices from Christ. The King doth nominate us, but Bishops do ordain us. . . . The confounding of those two distinct acts, . . . that is, Nomination or Election with Ordination or Consecration, hath begot many mistakes in the world &c.”

Whatever inclination Burnet Bishop of Salisbury had for Burnet. the Presbyterians, he does not explain differently the power of the King in spiritual matters. “The power of the King,” says he^a, “in Ecclesiastical matters among us, is expressed in this article (37) under those reserves, and with that moderation, that no just scruple can lie against it; and it is that which all the Kings, even of the Roman communion, do assume, and in some places with a much more unlimited authority. The methods of managing it may differ a little, yet the power is the same, and is built upon the same foundations. . . . In the strictest sense, as the head communicates vital influences to the whole body, Christ is the only Head of His Church; . . . But as head may in a figure stand for the fountain of order and government, of protection and conduct, the King or Queen may well be called The head of the Church.”

Doctor Brett^b, not to mention an infinity of others, has Brett. also maintained quite lately in his defence of Episcopacy, that the nomination made by the Prince is insufficient without Episcopal Consecration; that the Ordination of Bishops is necessary for the validity of the Sacraments; that no necessity can authorize the Laity without the mission and authority of the Bishops to administer them; and that Princes cannot without sacrilege assume to themselves such a power.

I ask now if the Ordinances of Parliament, which attribute Result. to the King a spiritual jurisdiction, interpreted in the sense in which the Kings themselves, the Synods of the Bishops, and individual Divines interpret them, can be made to

^z Page 134.

^a Exposition of the XXXIX. Articles, p. 387. [for 359.]

^b The Divine Right of Episcopacy, pp. 56, 61, 95, 116.

CHAP.
XI.

prove that the King is the centre of the spiritual authority? that he unites, so to say, in his own person the regal and the sacerdotal authority? and that the Bishops derive from him all their power in the government of the Church?

Admission.

All that can be concluded at most is, that the Kings have reserved to themselves a part of the exterior jurisdiction, which before had been the exclusive province of the Bishops.

Limitation.

This, accordingly, is what I will not contest, and this is all that these Commissions granted by Henry the Eighth and Edward the Sixth for the visitation of Churches prove; these prohibitions given to Bishops or Curates to preach out of their own dioceses or parishes; these orders or prohibitions to the Bishops to approve such and such persons for the Ecclesiastical functions; these Laws published in matters purely spiritual; in a word, all that is adduced to establish the spiritual power of the Kings of England: for in what manner, or in what sense soever all these Records are interpreted, it will never be found that these Princes did any thing more than encroach upon the external Ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and not that they performed any function proper to the Priesthood, and which might be reputed an action purely sacerdotal.

Bramhall.

This is what Archbishop Bramhall^c has exactly remarked. For besides that, according to him, the Statute which attributes all these powers to the Prince, ought not to be imputed to the Church of England, since Henry the Eighth was not then a Protestant; there is moreover every reason to think that the Parliament which gave him the spiritual authority, meant thereby only the exercise of the Ecclesiastical jurisdiction in the outer court. It is true that Cromwell was invested with the power of a Legate or a Commissioner in chief of Henry the Eighth, with the power to nominate other Commissioners, as the High Chancellors do. ^d “But the Kings of England,” adds he, “never grant Commissions of that nature to one single layman, how dear soever he be; but conjointly to him with others of maturity of judgment, of dexterity and skill in the laws, and also qualified by their callings” (that is to say, Ecclesiastics) “to act by excommunication or absolution according to the exigence of the matter. In brief, Henry

^c Works, pp. 1001. and 337.

^d Page 1001.

the Eighth did not impart holy Orders nor habitual jurisdiction, but constituted delegates by his Commission, to hear appeals, to see justice administered, as all his predecessors had done before him."

This appears to me the more certain because the same Parliament^e which gave the King the cognizance and decision of spiritual matters, sends him none the less to the Archbishop of Canterbury to have the dispensations which should be judged necessary; a proof that in granting the Prince a spiritual authority, it was not intended to derogate from the necessity of the Ecclesiastical Ministry, and that they granted him only an exterior direction, and a right to examine whether the Ecclesiastics acquitted themselves according to the duty of their profession.

It is certain then, according to the English Divines, that all these Commissions are ordinarily executed by Ecclesiastics, as the author of the Polity of the Church of England observes; ^f *Cujus auctoritatis exercitium ordinarie quibusdam Commissariis Ecclesiasticis, inter quos duo Archiepiscopi solent esse primi, mandat, ad ordinariam Episcoporum et Archidiaconorum jurisdictionem, ubi deficit, supplendam et corroborandam.* That the Bishops esteem their mission to be of divine right, and do not believe themselves indebted for it to the King: ^g "That Bishops ought to be in the Church," says James the First, "I ever maintained it, as an Apostolic institution, and so the ordinance of God." That though they get their election from the King, they refer their mission only to their Consecration, which they receive from none but Bishops. ^h *Sunt Episcopi per Consecrationem: ergo dum consecrantur, jurisdictionem accipiunt.—Ecce tibi Ecclesia Anglicana non modo munus ministeriale in genere, sed etiam disciplinæ administrationem in specie, id est, jurisdictionis potestatem, mediante Consecratione, tribuit.* That the King can neither exercise by himself nor cause to be exercised by others the spiritual authority annexed to Ordination, but simply depute capable Ministers to exercise the

25 Hen. 8. c. 21.

Doctrine of the English Divines.

^e Stat. at Large, vol. 1. p. 427. This Statute is given among the Proofs.
^f Polit. Eccl. Angl. c. 3. p. 22. et Deser. Jur. Eccl. sect. 2. p. 122.

^g Works of James I. [Premonition, see p. 192.] p. 305.
^h Masoni Vind. Eccl. Angl. lib. 4. c. 1. p. 423.

C H A P.
 XI.

exterior jurisdiction. ⁱ *Aliquando significat auctoritatem illam internam, in Ordinatione acceptam, a qua, tanquam a causa actiones ministeriales habent ut sint ratæ ac validæ; et hanc Principes sæculares nec ipsi habent, nec exercere vel conferre possunt: aliquando externam tantum facultatem, seu licentiam munus ministeriale legitima Ordinatione collatum exequendi denotat; et hanc Reges ministris doctis et piis conferre et possunt et debent, ut Augustino Ethelbertus.*

Presbyterians to be distinguished.

It is this second kind of jurisdiction, which, as we have seen, the English Divines allow the King; but for the first, they all with one accord deny him any such authority. ^k *Hanc potestatem, jurisdictionem, seu gubernationem universam, ad solam Ecclesiam spectare, et non ad Principem, omnes uno quasi ore affirmamus.* But when I say all the English Divines, I mean all those who follow the doctrine of that Church; for as for the Presbyterians, I know they are of very different principles. It is accordingly on the principles of these latter that the Kings of England have acted, if they have sometimes attributed to themselves a power purely spiritual; ^l that they have so abased Episcopacy, as to cause the Bishops to be cited before Lay-visitors charged with the King's Commission; that these Commissioners have so far exceeded in their powers, as to pronounce sentences of excommunication in virtue of the King's spiritual authority; and that, in short, the preaching of the word and the administration of the Sacraments excepted, they have executed by Lay-visitors all that belongs to the jurisdiction of Bishops, and is inherent in their character.

Their excesses.

But it is not by acts disavowed by the Church of England, that we ought to judge of the form and nature of the King's power. At the beginning of the English Reformation, a numerous party of Presbyterians, in credit with these Princes by the chief places which they held both in Church and State, were often guilty of excess in the steps they appointed them to take; and it is not surprising that under Henry the Eighth, and still less under Edward the Sixth, and in the beginning of Queen Elizabeth's reign, they should

ⁱ Ibid. c. 2. p. 430.

^k Ibid. p. 433.

^l Burnet, part 2. p. 26. and 400.

and Records, Book 1. No. 7. and Book 3. No. 7. Collier, part 2. p. 436.

have induced these Princes to assume to themselves rights which belonged only to the Bishops. But we have seen both by the synodical decrees, and even by the consent of Elizabeth and James the First, they did not pretend to any other spiritual function, than that of passing laws for the good order of the Church, of supporting by their authority those made by the Bishops; of retaining the Ecclesiastics as well as Laics in the submission due to the Prince; of preventing the jurisdiction of any foreign Power, and of having by themselves or their deputies, a general inspection over the doctrine and discipline, to prevent any innovation being made without their authority; and that that order might be preserved which should be found established by the laws.

Author-
ized doc-
trine.

So that neither the example of Cromwell under Henry the Eighth, nor that of the Duke of Somerset under Edward the Sixth, nor that of some other Lords in the reign of Elizabeth, even when viewed in the most disadvantageous light, prove anything; for these were extravagant proceedings contrary to all the rules, and against which were drawn up the Canons of the Synod of London, approved by Queen Elizabeth herself, and since confirmed both by the Clergy and by the Kings. All that can be concluded at most from these excesses is, that the Bishops cannot acquire or confer any lawful jurisdiction in a Church where the King usurps such a jurisdiction. But how can it be proved from this, that all they do in the administration of the Sacraments is null and invalid? This appears impossible. Accordingly M. l'Abbé Renaudot has not pressed a difficulty of which he saw very well he could make no use in the defence of his cause; and we do not see in fact how a man could prove null an Ordination which was performed by consecrated Bishops, and wherein nothing essential was omitted.

How much
may be
justly in-
ferred.

For even though it were proved that the alteration of the Rite was made by the authority of the King and Parliament, it is sufficient to take away all scruple concerning the validity of the Ordinations, to know that in the consent of the Parliament that of the Clergy is included, the Bishops being by their office members of that illustrious body, and the Ecclesiastical laws there proposed, having been discussed beforehand by the Clergy. For that assembly does no more in

Clergy
included
in the Par-
liament.

CHAP. XI. England than what our Kings do in France ; that is to say, he seals with the seal of the sovereign authority the Ecclesiastical regulations, in order to maintain by his protection laws which would perhaps be neglected, if the public authority did not procure their execution.

Conclu-
sion.

Let persons then prove as much as they please, that the new Bishops were ordained contrary to law ; that every thing was irregular, both as to their Election and as to their Ordination ; that the Princes, by their usurpation of the rights of the Bishops, have degraded their mission, making themselves, so to say, its centre and principle ; in a word, that they have made confusion in the Church and Ministry, and that they have spread by this means a legitimate doubt over the validity of the Ordinations : I agree as to the disorder and confusion, but as to the doubt, it can have no place, so long as there are proofs so certain that the Ordination was performed by Bishops duly consecrated, and that all was there observed which could be essential to this Sacrament ; and this, it appears to me, has been so demonstrated as to leave no reply.

(PART, OR VOLUME, II. OF THE ORIGINAL.)

CHAP. XII.

ANSWER TO THE FIFTH DIFFICULTY. THE DOUBTS OF DIVINES, WHO REGARD THE ENGLISH ORDINATIONS AS NULL, ARE NOT SUFFICIENT TO MAKE THEM DUBIOUS, NOR CONSEQUENTLY INVALID.

AFTER all the proofs we have produced of the succession of the Bishops in the Church of England, and of the conformity of the new Ritual with the Roman Pontifical as to the substance of matters, it would be difficult not to allow that the invalidity of the English Ordinations cannot be clearly proved. Accordingly the most moderate content themselves with saying, that in truth it is not altogether certain that these Ordinations are null, but that notwithstanding all the proofs to the contrary, there still remains a reasonable doubt; and that while the doubt exists, the Ordination must be repeated; for according to the maxim of St. Leo, that is not accounted as repeated which cannot be proved to have been done. ^a *Quod non ostenditur gestum, ratio non sinit ut videatur iteratum.*

Such is the turn that Champney has taken, and after him several other Divines, to prove that the Ordinations made according to King Edward's Ritual are null, and that they cannot stand. For, says he, an Ordination made according to an opinion which is but probable, is not valid, while this opinion remains simply probable, and there is another more probable; and a Bishop who is but probably a Bishop, is really none at all. ^b *Ordinatio tantum probabilis, vel quæ probabiliter tantum sufficiens est et valida, constituit Episcopum tantum probabilem, vel qui probabiliter tantum est Episcopus. . . .* ^c *Sed qui est tantum probabiliter Episcopus, non est validè sufficienterque in Episcopali gradu et potestate constitutus, neque veram habet vocationem Episcopalem. Nam vera validaque potestas seu vocatio Episcopalis, non est tantum probabilis, sed certa et indubitata.*

But, according to Champney, the English Ordinations cannot be regarded as certain, but simply as probable, as well

^a Leo M. Ep. 2.

[^c Ibid. p. 424, 425.]

^b De Vocat. Minist. c. 13. p. 424.

C H A P. because of Barlow's Consecration, of which there is no cer-
 XII. tainty, as because of the Rite itself of the Ordination, which is assuredly less probable than that of the Pontifical which was abolished. Since then these Ordinations can be regarded only as probable, there is no other course to take than to repeat them, because in the case of a Sacrament we are obliged, on pain of nullity, to take the surest course. ^d*Qui ergo in sacris ordinibus conferendis notam, certam, atque universaliter receptam materiam et formam relinqueret, aliâque quæ tantum probabilis est uteretur, non solum temeritatem sacrilegam committeret, sed etiam eandem actionem, usitatam et indubitam materiam et formam adhibendo, sub conditione saltem, repetere teneretur; quandoquidem probabile saltem est, quod in priori actione nihil fecerit.* ["He therefore who in conferring holy Orders should forsake the known, certain, and universally received matter and form, would not only be guilty of a sacrilegious temerity, but also be bound conditionally at least to repeat the action, using the accustomed and undoubted matter and form; forasmuch as it is at least probable that in the former action he did nothing at all."]

Answer.

Though this difficulty has appeared of weight to many Divines, it has nevertheless more brilliancy than solidity; for a doubt ought to have no influence on practice except so far as it is founded on certain facts and reasonable principles. For, as St. Leo teaches us, to make a doubt allowable, and such as will justify the repetition of a Sacrament, there must be no proof or testimony that can assure us of the truth of the thing of which we have some room to doubt. ^e*Utrum nemo sit penitens*, says this Father, *qui testimonio suo jurare possit ignorantiam nescientis.* There must be no evidence among those who are able to inform themselves of the truth of the facts. ^f*Si nulla existant indicia inter propinquos et familiares, inter clericos atque vicinos.*

But in the present question, nothing is less solid than the principles, and nothing less certain than the facts, on which the alleged doubt is founded. For it is evident by the objection, that this doubt has no other foundation than the uncertainty of Barlow's Consecration, and the novelty of the Rite

^d Ibid. p. 425.

^e Leo M. Ep. 135.

^f Id. Ep. 2.

used on this occasion. But, by what has been said before, it is easy to prove that there is nothing in these two points on which to build a reasonable doubt, and that, on the contrary, we have domestic testimonies more than enough to establish the facts concerning which they would have us doubt; and consequently the difficulty falls of itself.

For, 1. As to the novelty of the Rite, it is very certain that ^{1. Novelty.} it can be no foundation for a reasonable scruple. In fact, although, if the difficulty in question be judged of by the disagreement of the Divines who have disputed on this subject, we can regard only as probable the opinion of those who make the matter and form of Ordination consist solely in the imposition of hands, and the prayer which accompanies it; yet this view becomes demonstrable and certain, when it comes to be decided by the number and quality of the proofs. If you ask the reason, the learned Father Morinus ^{Morinus.} furnishes it in two words, in this passage: “^g You will ask, and that justly, on what ground I am of this opinion. On one which is certain, easy, and allowed by all. For those things do not belong to the substance of a Sacrament which the Greeks never used, and the Latins not for many centuries.” It is not true, then, that the new Rite, used from Edward the Sixth’s time, is no more than probable. It is yet less true, that it is less probably valid than the other. For a Rite founded on Scripture and tradition, cannot, without error, be reputed less probable than another which is known to be modern, and of which, so to say, we know the date. But such is the imposition of hands, accompanied with prayer, which all the learned regard as making the sole essence of this Sacrament, and which are preserved in the English Ritual. For as the learned Habert Bishop of Vabres ^{Habert.} very well observes, “^h Whatever the sign is, which alone the Holy Scripture has expressed in speaking of any Sacrament,

^g Interrogabis, et meritò, quâ ratione id iudico. Certâ, facili, et ab omnibus concessâ. Ea enim ad substantiam Sacramenti non pertinent, quæ Græci nunquam usurpârunt, nec multis sæculis Latini. *Morinus de Pœn.* l. 8. c. 18. [§ 2.] p. 568.

^h Quodeumque symbolum est, quod quidem solum Scriptura sacra expressit in alicujus Sacramenti mentione faci-

endâ, illud revera modis omnibus—huic Sacramento intrinsicè ac essentialè est. Quotiescumque verò in Scripturâ fit mentio Ordinationis Sacramentalis, non alio symbolo, non aliâ notâ, non aliâ ceremoniâ quam manuum impositione designatur, . . . Scripturæ igitur Ordinationis aut nihil est, aut manûs impositio est. *Lib. Pontif. Eccl. Gr.* p. 120.

C H A P.
XII.

that in reality is in all respects intrinsic and essential to that Sacrament. But whenever in the Scripture there is mention of Sacramental Ordination, it is designated by no other sign, no other note, no other ceremony, than the imposition of hands: Scriptural Ordination, then, either is nothing, or is the imposition of hands." In this way also do Father Goar, M. Hallier, and all those who are well informed on this subject, express themselves.

Can it then be the novelty of the form that gives more weight to the doubt in question? But as to that, there ought not to be much more difficulty: for as we have seen with respect to those forms which are not determined, it is in the power of each Church to express things in the way which to herself appears most suitable; and the only thing essential is, that she should set forth the end and effect of the Sacrament, as the same Bishop of Vabres expresses it. ⁱ*In Sacramentis quorum materia et forma in sacris Scripturis expressa non est, supponendum planè Christum utramque in genere solùm Apostolis instituisse, relictâ Ecclesiæ potestate eas variis modis, ut liberet, designandi, constituendi, ac determinandi, dummodò præcipuum institutionis caput, intentio, scopusque servetur, ac generalis quædam aptitudo et analogia ad significandum Sacramenti effectum, gratiam, et characterem. Quæ quidem analogia par omnino est et integra in utroque ritu, Romano et Græco.* ["In Sacraments whose matter and form has not been expressed in the Scriptures, we must lay down for certain that Christ instituted both only in general to the Apostles, leaving to the Church the power of marking out, appointing, and determining them in various ways, as she thought proper, provided the chief head, intention, and scope, and a certain general fitness and analogy for expressing the effect, grace, and character of the Sacrament, were preserved. Which analogy indeed is altogether similar and entire in both Rites, the Roman and the Greek."] But this analogy is found to have been observed in the new English Rite with the same exactness as in that of Rome, as one may satisfy one's self by comparing, as it is easy to do, one with the other. Where then is the ground for doubt?

Certain words.

If the form of this Sacrament consisted in certain words,

ⁱ Ibid. p. 125.

which alone were regarded as essential, and these words were not found in the Rite of the English Church, there would then be some reason to suppose that this Sacrament was entirely null: but where will it be found that these have been determined elsewhere than in the writings of some Schoolmen, who have frequently, as Morinus very judiciously observes, made the essence of a Sacrament to consist in what was but a mere ceremony? ¹ *Contingit autem aliquando eorum aliquos à vero tam immaniter aberrare, ut in Ritu Romano ea pro solis materiis et formis adnotent, quæ ad Sacramenti tantùm solemnitate et significationis ampliacionem spectant.* These words then not having been determined, and having even varied according to times and places, it is not possible to attach the substance of Ordination to certain prayers of one Church more than to those of another, when both alike contain its spirit. The practice of the Church justifies it, and far from authorizing the doubt, tends only to dissipate it; since, it being certain by the usage of the Churches that one form has not been kept to more than another, there is no solid reason to doubt of the English Ordinations, whose prayers represent perfectly the end, effect, and nature of this Sacrament, which is all that Divines require in such a case: *Dummodò præcipuum institutionis caput, intentio, scopusque servetur, ac generalis quædam aptitudo et analogia ad significandum Sacramenti effectum, gratiam, et characterem.*

The novelty of the Rite then can furnish no ground for such a doubt; unless at least we suppose that, though the Rite has of itself nothing reprehensible, the want of authority in the Church that introduced it, is sufficient to make it null. But we have proved in the tenth Chapter, both by the usage of the Churches, and by principles that are incontestable, that the different ways of expressing the forms of the Sacraments are but a matter of pure discipline; that every Church has a right to draw up her own; that although in important points it is not allowable for any Church to make a change which may impair peace and good order, yet such a change is not enough to render a Sacrament null; that a heretical or schismatical Church does not lose by her heresy or her schism the right to make such changes; that the Sacraments therein adminis-

¹ Morinus, *ibid.* [Translated, p. 113.]

CHAP. tered have not been regarded as null, even when the forms
 XII. have been drawn up during the heresy or the schism ; in a
 word, that nothing but the corruption of the substance of the
 matter or of the form could make it be regarded as null.

Changes
 not essen-
 tial.

We have shewn elsewhere, in the sixth and following chapters, that the substance of the form was not at all altered in King Edward's Ritual ; that in the prayers of the Ordination, excepting some mystical and figurative expressions which have been removed, they have retained all that can relate to the effect of the Sacrament, and to the duties of the Ministry ; that they there invoke the Holy Ghost, and ask of Him, in behalf of the Ministry, all the graces necessary for the fulfilment of all its duties ; that they have even preserved formulæ which cannot be regarded as essential, so careful were they not to make too violent changes ; that the different orders of the Hierarchy are there exactly distinguished ; that what was omitted has never been thought essential : in fine, that it is impossible to justify the Ordinations of any other Church whatsoever, if the form which has been preserved in the Church of England be reputed defective and invalid.

Objection
 from non-
 recogni-
 tion.

Here is enough to dissipate the most legitimate doubts. Nevertheless, it is said, if in the alteration made there was nothing to make us doubt of the validity of the English Ordinations, how is it that the Catholic Bishops and Divines have never been willing to acknowledge these Bishops for true Bishops ? And why has it in consequence been thought necessary to re-ordain all those who re-united themselves to the Church ? If the invalidity of the Ordination had not appeared sufficiently attested, should we have seen so much unanimity in rejecting it ? And is not so great a conformity of judgment on the subject at least strong enough to be the foundation of a serious and solid doubt ?

Answer.

Were we to judge of the solidity of a doubt by the number of those that raise it, nothing certainly would be so reasonable as the doubt in question : but, as it is no further solid than it is supported by good reasons, it is at most a prejudice easily dissipated by the examination of the facts and proofs. In fact how many reasons have contributed to make us form an incorrect judgment on the subject ? The little learning of the Divines of those times, the greater part of whom had very

Causes.

confused and unexact ideas of what we call the matter and form of the Sacraments; the indignation of Queen Mary against the Bishops who had made so many changes in the old Religion, and of whom the greater part had been strongly opposed to it in her Brother's reign; the zeal of the Catholics, who, to render more odious the persons and conduct of the Reformed Bishops, were delighted to be able to imagine to themselves any nullity in their Ordination; in fine, the inclination and fancy of several English Bishops for the discipline of Geneva, which contributed yet more to make it believed, that their Ordination did not differ much from that of the Presbyterians; all these reasons united, have contributed effectually to make the Catholics imagine, that the Ordinations performed according to Edward the Sixth's Ritual were insufficient and invalid. And I am not surprised, that in a time of heat like that in which all these changes were made, they should have been less favourable to Ordinations which were on other grounds very odious to them.

But, notwithstanding all these prejudices, which have formed the opinion of the Bishops and the Divines of that time, we cannot any farther regard this doubt as founded on reason, than it is also supported by something solid.

Doubts
must have
some founda-
tion :

In fact, the validity of Ordinations has never been judged of by the ill-founded doubts of Divines. When at Rome formerly, there were so many different opinions about the Ordinations of Formosus and Constantine, as we shall see in the following chapter, was it thought that these different judgments, and the doubts arising from them, justified the prejudiced conduct of the Popes who caused these Ordinations to be reiterated? Just so, when Morinus was at Rome in 1639^k, he found a Congregation established to examine into the validity of the Greek Ordinations. It was therefore doubted of at that time; and ought we to have given weight to such a doubt against these Ordinations, of which no reasonable Divine can question the validity? It is not then by the doubt that we must judge of the validity of the Ordinations, but by the reasons on which the doubt rests, nor can any conclusion be drawn from this doubt by itself; because every doubt does not render a Sacrament invalid. We cannot

^k Morinus de Sac. Ordin. Pref.

CHAP.
XII.

which this
has not.

then give it weight here any farther than there is room to believe that the form was defective, or that the alteration therein made affected the substance. But it has been shewn so plainly that nothing essential was therein altered, and that in comparing it with the ancient Orders of Service which have been published, the differences which are found are of very little importance, that we cannot employ this difference as a fit ground to create a reasonable doubt with respect to these Ordinations.

Objection.
"Barlow's
Consecra-
tion uncer-
tain."

There remains, then, to support this doubt, nothing but to make use of the uncertainty of Barlow's Consecration, as the only reason that can in any manner justify the Bishops and Divines who have refused to allow the validity of the English Ordinations. For, say they, though it cannot be demonstrated that he was not consecrated, there remains nevertheless obscurity enough on this point to raise just suspicions, and to give to the doubt all the weight necessary to make his Ordination uncertain, little probable, and consequently null and invalid.

Answer.

But this second difficulty is found effectually cleared up by what we have said of the Ordination of Barlow in the third, fourth, and fifth Chapters. There are there collected so many proofs of his Consecration that persons are forced to own that it cannot be proved that he was not consecrated, and now confine themselves to the mere doubt. But it seems to me that it is not difficult to shew that there is no room even for a doubt in the least reasonable. For, 1. had there been but a little room to doubt of Barlow's Consecration, persons would not have failed to have objected it against Parker, and to have drawn thence a strong proof against his own Ordination. Nevertheless, among all the reproaches cast in his teeth, and among all the arguments brought to invalidate his Consecration, it is not found that the defect of Barlow's Consecration was ever urged. Can we suppose that a doubt imagined fifty years afterwards, can do any injury to the validity of an Ordination?

1. Long
silence.

2. Grounds
of objec-
tion frivo-
lous.

2. I am quite willing to allow that our business here is to inform ourselves of the truth of the fact, and that it is never too late to examine the truth, especially when there are great interests depending on it. But yet, what can be opposed

to the proofs of Barlow's Consecration sufficiently strong to create any reasonable doubt of it? The loss of a Record supplied by a great number of others. An omission of registration from which advantage is taken against Barlow alone, although a number of similar omissions are produced, which never caused the Consecration of those Bishops to be called in question of whom there is no mention made in the Registers. A Record incorrectly transcribed by Rymer, from which no conclusion could be drawn against Barlow, even were it found to be such as that compiler gives it us in his Collection. A chimerical threat, which never had any existence, and which, were it as real as it is imaginary, could prove nothing against Barlow's Consecration; because, as has been shewn in the fifth chapter, even though it were true that Bonner had menaced the Bishop of Landaff with excommunication, yet the case of Barlow being quite different, the omission of that menace with respect to him, could not be urged as prejudicial to his Consecration.

3. It can therefore be on mere presumptions and simple conjectures, that this doubt is supported. It is also, at best, only by making use of this inclination of Barlow's for the discipline of Geneva, and his errors on the subject of the Sacraments, and in particular on that of Ordination, that any appearance of probability could be given to the suspicions which the loss of the Record of Consecration, or rather the omission of the registering, may have occasioned. But, in truth, what appearance of reason is there in giving weight to probabilities and conjectures contradicted by authentic Records, by facts not contested, and by testimonies anterior to the Consecration of Parker, that is to say, to the only time when there was an interest in supposing it true.

For, in short, if Barlow had not been truly consecrated, is it possible that, during almost four and twenty years, which passed between his Ordination and Parker's, there should be found no one proper test to acquaint us with the truth? That in times when he might have freely discovered himself, as that of the reign of Edward, we see nothing but what persuades us that he was truly a Bishop? That in the reign of Mary, when he was forced to quit his country to seek an asylum among the Protestants, he should not have taken off

CHAP.
XII.

his mask, and made it known that he was no more than a nominal Bishop, and that he had received no other Ordination than that of a mere Minister? In a word, that we find neither in his conduct nor in his words, neither in the testimonies of his friends nor in the reproaches of his enemies, any thing but what persuades us that this Prelate was consecrated like all the rest; and that no legitimate doubt can be raised against him, which cannot be made use of against an infinity of other Bishops of that time, if once the door be opened for conjectures in opposition to facts?

Shifting
of the
ground.

Yet, if these two particulars, which might support with some sort of foundation the suspicions it is wished to make use of against the validity of the English Ordinations, turn out to be without force and without reason, what becomes then of the doubt of which they wish to take advantage, in order to ruin the succession of the English Bishops? For it is now almost the only argument that is pressed against them.

Nag's-head
fable.

For a certain time the Fable of the Nag's-head was insisted upon. This was the argument and the demonstration to which our Divines submitted, in default of the power of satisfying themselves of the falsehood and ridiculousness of that chimera. Now all the world abandons it, and we almost blush for our forefathers, for having carried their credulity so far. They then changed the attack to the side of the form: some Divines still hold this a good objection; but it is not necessary to enter upon argument to make learned men abandon this weak resource. Let a man but consult the ancient Orders of Service, the Canons of the Council of Carthage, and even our new Pontifical; let him compare the new English Ritual with all these, and then let him judge whether there be any thing wanting of what antiquity thought essential to Ordination, and whether any thing be therein retrenched but what we regard as mere ceremonies, added, to use the expression of Morinus, *ad Sacramenti tantum solemnitatem, et significationis ampliationem*, "merely for the solemnity of the Sacrament, and the fuller setting forth of its meaning." I am very willing to refer myself to my readers on this head.

Form.

Barlow.

After this they insisted much on Barlow; but at length this hold itself became hard to defend. For to make this

good, it is necessary to believe that all the laws of the kingdom were violated, that many Records were forged, that in the Parliament they passed over a ceremony which before and since his time has always been regarded as essential; and what is more, that the thing had been both secret and public at the same time, as has been shewn. All this is hard to digest; and accordingly they are now almost reduced to confine themselves to the doubt. But I question whether they will hold to that long. For they scarcely dare any longer to doubt either the falsehood of the Nag's-head Fable, or the sufficiency of the Ritual, or the Consecration of Barlow. This doubt is therefore a metaphysical thing, founded upon nothing, and which subsists only because there is an inclination and an interest in doubting. If such doubts injure the validity of the Sacraments, it is easy to make them invalid when one pleases.

But I will add one thing more before quitting this subject. Champney says, that to use an uncertain and less probable form in the matter of the Sacraments, is not merely to commit a sacrilege, but also to render the Sacrament null and invalid. This is also the opinion of most Divines, and is the ground of the sentence of Pope Innocent the Eleventh, and of the Clergy of France, against a proposition authorizing us to follow the less sure and less probable opinion in the administration of the Sacraments. This condemnation is very just, and I freely subscribe to this doctrine.

Objection of
Champ-
ney.

But I am surprised that persons should make use of this difficulty, which has almost no relation to our case. For, in short, when the Committee of Bishops appointed in King Edward's time to draw up the new Ritual, had proposed to make such changes as they should think necessary, these Prelates were persuaded that they did follow the most sure and most probable side. It was in fact more sure and more probable, that imposition of hands and prayer alone made the essence of Ordination, and not all the rest of the ceremonies which were added by parcels and at different times. All our most able Divines acknowledge it at this day. They had no doubt on this head. If our Catholic Divines had any doubt, it was owing to the prejudices and the ignorance of the age; and such a doubt had no influence on the validity

Answer.

CHAP.
XII.

of the Ordination of those with whom it had no place. To what purpose then would it be now to avail one's self of a doubt which the administrators of this Sacrament had not, and which others ought not to have had, and which is only criminal in those who, notwithstanding such a doubt, of the bottom of which they are ignorant, act against the testimony of their own conscience, which reproveth them, and which ought to suspend all their operations?

Parallel
opposite
argument.

This then is not the case in which the doubt ought to hinder from acting, and in which it renders all that is done invalid. And to destroy Champney's whole argument, it is sufficient to oppose to his, one entirely contrary to it, whereof the evidence itself will form the proof. He says¹, that an Ordination which is only probable, makes only a probable Bishop; and that a Bishop who is only probably a Bishop, is not one validly. To which I oppose this argument. A certain Ordination makes a certain Bishop, and a man is truly a Bishop when he is one with certainty. But the Ordination in question is certain; for every Ordination is certain when it includes what is essential to Ordination, that is to say, imposition of hands, prayer, and the Consecrator. But such is the English Ordination, as has been shewn at great length throughout this Treatise, and as all those will be able to convince themselves, who will take the trouble to investigate the facts.

Doubts to
be distin-
guished.

But I say more. Every doubt on this subject does not render a Sacrament invalid. The matter and form of the Sacraments is a thing much disputed of in the Schools: there is scarcely any point thereof on which there has not been some variety of opinions. Nevertheless, though something should be omitted which some Divines judged essential, the Sacrament would not become invalid for that reason alone that some Divines judged so. It is not enough even that the doubt they might raise should be real; it must also be solidly founded upon Ecclesiastical monuments proper to establish its obligation; without which no account would be had of such a doubt. For example, it is known that two hundred years ago, a great number of Divines thought the delivery of the instruments essential to Ordination. In spite of this opinion, founded on ignorance, who now would regard as invalid an

¹ De Vocat. Minist. [c. 13.] p. 424.

Ordination in which it had been omitted? and what man of ability would presume to declare for its invalidity? The practice is, in truth, to supply what had been omitted; but this is only as the exorcisms after Baptism are supplied; not because they are thought necessary, but as a mark of respect to the orders of the Church, and to render more present to us the spirit whereby she is animated, and the functions which she prescribes.

So that in what light soever we view this doubt, it is impossible to conclude from it the invalidity of the English Ordinations; nor can any other use be made of it, but to prove that the endeavour has been only to embarrass the facts, and to make a thing obscure which of itself would have caused but little difficulty, had men been willing to reason by principle, and inform themselves without prejudice of all that might serve to the clearing up of the truth.

I should have stopped here, if the authors of the *Journal de Trevoux* had not given me occasion to add something to clear up two difficulties which they have lately proposed on this subject to the author of the Apologetic Letter for the Succession of the Bishops in the Church of England^m. The first relates to the difference between Divines as to what is the essential matter and form of Ordination. The second is taken from the defect of the Priesthood, which it is supposed there is in the English Ministers. Let us examine them both. I am surprised that they have appeared solid to those who give themselves out for their authors.

I have before touched on the first in the beginning of this chapter, so that it will not long detain me. Divines, it is saidⁿ, are divided as to what makes the essence of the matter and form of this Sacrament. Be it allowed, if it is wished, that it is probable, that imposition of hands and prayer, are the only essentials of Ordination: it must at least be admitted, that the contrary opinion has had and has still a great number of defenders: therefore it is true, that it is probable also, that imposition of hands and prayer are not all that is essential to Episcopal Ordination: it may therefore lawfully be believed that these Ordinations are invalid, and it will be always true that the English Bishops are not, or ought not to pass for, sufficiently

Summing up.

Journal de Trevoux. Two difficulties.

First.

^m April, 1722. Art. 38. p. 708. et seq.

ⁿ Ib. p. 723.

CHAP.
XII.

ordained, since it is probable that their Ordination is imperfect. To this argument may be reduced all the declamation of the authors of the Memoire, who have but enlarged upon Champney's reasoning before mentioned, and which will pass for a demonstration only with the defenders of probability.

Answer.

But I am surprised, that these Divines, after having been so often beaten on their pretended outward probability, should wish to employ it again in a matter of this nature, where all that is wanted is but to inform one's self of the practice of the Churches, and not at all of the metaphysical reasonings of Divines. Were the question to be decided by their authority, it would be in vain for us to cite some of them, because the testimony of those which would be opposed to them would be a counterbalance to the authority of the former. But when I quote a Father Morin, a Father Mabillon, a Father Martin, a Father Goar, and such others, it is not to their testimony that I send the reader: it is to the authentic monuments they have produced, to the most ancient and venerable Rituals, to the most unsuspected Pontificals, to the Roman Orders of Service, to the Greek Euchologies, to the testimonies of the ancients; in a word, to all that can convince us as to the practice of the Churches on this head. If it depended on simple reasoning, one might oppose author to author, Father to Father, Divine to Divine; and in such an opposition, where even principles are often not agreed on, we might regard as simply probable a question which a superior authority or an evident reason could not decide.

We must
be guided
by facts.

But this is not our case: our question is of a matter of fact. The documents to decide it are in our own hands, and we have nothing to do but to consult them. Let Durand or St. Antonin, Suarez or Vasquez, Isambert or Gamachius, think as they please, we shall still be obliged to come back to what was done or what was omitted, and by this to determine of the necessity or non-necessity of the rites or Ecclesiastical ceremonies: for we cannot regard as essential that which has not been practised either every where or always; and upon these subjects the rule of our faith is formed on that of our usages.

But according to this principle, which every judicious Divine will think incontestable, what becomes of the extrinsic probability of the author of the difficulties? If this question

is not to be determined by the decision of Divines, but by the nature of the proofs, and the authority of the ancient Ecclesiastical monuments, can we doubt for a moment that prayer and imposition of hands are the only essential parts of Ordination? It is only by reasoning on the Sacraments “without the exact knowledge of the facts”, says M. l’Abbé Fleury^o, that the Schoolmen “have sometimes regarded as essential, ceremonies which are but accessory, as the unction, and the delivery of the chalice to the Priesthood, whereas what is essential in this Sacrament is the imposition of hands.” Let us not dwell upon opinions founded solely on ignorance of ancient tradition; but let us go back to the first sources, to see whether the contrary opinions will find there the least degree of probability. But how, in a time when the greater part of the ceremonies of the Roman Pontifical and of its formulæ were not in use, will they find wherewith to prove their necessity? And if they were not formerly thought necessary, why should it be maintained that they are so now? The pretended probability then of the necessity of all these ceremonies is a chimera; and to wish to found the invalidity of the English Ordinations upon such an opinion, is to make the validity of a Sacrament depend on the opinions of some Divines, although those opinions are destitute of any foundation in antiquity.

But, it is said, the Scripture does not clearly and distinctly Objection. determine the matter and form of Ordinations; there is nothing in the Fathers and Councils that can give a sure foundation to the opinion of the sufficiency of the imposition of hands; and even though there were in the Church any decision in favour of this opinion, the Catholic Church is to the English an incompetent tribunal, whose judgment they reject, and from whom, consequently, they cannot draw any advantage. Thus the whole matter is limited to the judgment of Divines, which being found divided, can make only a probable opinion, the probability of which does not destroy a contrary probability, and by consequence does not sufficiently assure the validity of the Ordinations.

Nothing is more false than what is here advanced, that Answer. there is nothing either in Scripture or tradition which can

^o Hist. Eccles. tom. 17. Disc. 5. p. xviii.

CHAP.
XII.

assure the sufficiency of imposition of hands and of prayer in Ordination. I will grant that the Scripture does not clearly and distinctly determine the matter and form of Ordinations; but at least it names imposition of hands and prayer, and names nothing else. This indication is supported by the testimony of Fathers and Councils; and what is decisive is, that the practice of the Church, represented in the ancient Pontificals and other Ecclesiastical books, being found to be conformable to these testimonies, does not leave the least probability of the necessity of any thing else. Nor is the judgment of the Catholic Church so incompetent a tribunal as is supposed. It is not the cause of the Anglicans that is concerned herein: it is that of the whole Church: and even if the question did concern only the English, who reject her infallibility, yet in a matter of this nature, the practice of the ancient Church alone forms a proof, to which they have always professed to be willing to conform. To reduce then this whole answer to a few words, it is certain that the Scripture implies the sufficiency of the imposition of hands and of prayer, and implies nothing else; that the Fathers and Councils support it incontestably; and that the practice of the Church demonstrates it. But a practice thus established and demonstrated, leaves no probability to the contrary practice. That opinion then of the Divines which favours the necessity of the other ceremonies, is neither true nor even probable; and the other alone is probable, and consequently is perfectly sure in practice.

Proofs.

Who told you, say they, that those who do not think as you do are in error? But should that be asked when there are at hand proofs so strong and so numerous? Who told it me, say you? It is the Scripture, which teaches it me by the silence it observes with respect to so many modern ceremonies: it is the Fathers and Councils, who did not so much as know the practices of the necessity of which you wish to make use: it is the Greek Church, which has been unacquainted with them to this day, and professes to be unacquainted with them still: it is our own Churches, who did not receive the greater part of them till these later ages; the Rituals too, and the ancient Pontificals, making no mention of them. Ought we to hesitate, with such authorities, in rejecting an opinion haz-

arded by some Schoolmen, who judging of the first times by their own age, have been so rash as to determine upon the matter and form of the Sacraments by metaphysical precisions, without having any just idea of these subjects, nor any knowledge of the ancient discipline?

And besides, as I have before observed, if once you make the certainty or the validity of the Sacraments to depend on the doubts or opinions of Divines, what that is certain will remain to us in this class of things? Some are divided as to the form of a Sacrament; others as to the matter; some even as to the administrator. This will have a deprecatory form, the other will have an imperative one; some admit for the matter one thing, others another; there will be no end to the doubts, if we must hold to their opinion as a rule. But these sort of opinions have never been made use of in determining the validity of a Sacrament. The usage and practice of each Church in things undetermined is the great rule. It is by this that we justify the Greeks: it is by this that we have received the Sacraments of the Orientals. It is allowed you to supply all the ceremonies which religion, or solemnity inspires you to add; but their omission does not in the least derogate from the validity of the Sacraments conferred without them; and it is certain, that the opinions of Divines cannot render necessary ceremonies whose non-necessity is demonstrated by the contrary practice of the Churches, and their omission for many ages.

I proceed to the second difficulty, which is not more solid, but which is singular enough to deserve to be given in the very words of the author, for fear that I should seem to weaken it. "Add," says he^p, "that the Episcopal necessarily supposes the Sacerdotal Ordination, as an essential and requisite disposition according to the Catholic doctrine. But you have not among you other Anglicans the foundation of the Sacerdotal Ordination. For in the opinion of the Church, the Priesthood of the new Covenant principally and essentially includes the power to consecrate and sacrifice the adorable Body and Blood of Jesus Christ; a power which passes among you for a thing as chimerical as the Sacrifice itself; a power which you reject, and which your Ordinations

^p Journal de Trevoux, April 1722. p. 729.

CHAP. XII. give not; consequently the Catholics will have a right to dispute with your Prelates the title of Bishops, so long as they shall be persuaded, that you have no longer among you any true Priests."

Not new. I do not know whether the author of the difficulties pretends here to propose to us something new; but the truth is, that Champney had before made use of the same thing, and that Mason had then answered it in an entire book. "Whence it necessarily follows," says Champney, "that those pretended Bishops . . . neither are nor ever were true Bishops; forasmuch as they were never true Priests; that is to say, they had not the power of offering the true Sacrifice. And hence, that they have such and so essential a defect of Episcopal calling, beyond all their predecessors, that even though those first had been true Bishops, yet these cannot be such." This is exactly the objection of the author of the difficulties; who, as we see, has nothing that deserves a new answer. But be this difficulty old or new, this is not the point in question: our business is to ascertain whether it be solid, and this is what we must examine.

Merely subsidiary. The manner in which the author proposes it does not altogether incline one to believe it. It is a kind of subsidiary reason, which he appears to hazard not so much with the hope of fortifying his cause, as with a design of embarrassing an adversary by the delicacy of the matters on which he wishes to oblige him to explain himself, and which it is difficult to treat to the taste of a certain number of Divines. For the rest, he has reason not to build much on such an argument. All its propositions are false or very uncertain; and I am surprised that a man should announce such writings to the public with an air of complaisance, as if there were something very singular to learn in them.

All its propositions false or very uncertain.

For it is false, that Episcopal Ordination supposes the Sacerdotal; and it is a rashness yet more to be condemned than ignorance itself, to make a Catholic dogma out of a false-

⁹ Unde necessario sequitur, præten-
sos illos Episcopos . . . non esse neque
fuisse veros Episcopos, quandoquidem
veri Sacerdotes non fuerint; hoc est,
verum Sacrificium offerendi potestatem
non habuerint. Ac proinde talem tam-

que essentialem Episcopalis vocationis
defectum super omnes prædecessores
suos habere, ut etiamsi illi veri Epis-
copi fuissent, isti tamen tales esse non
possint. *De Vocat. Min.* c. 18. p. 740.

hood. It is false, that the Sacerdotal power is conferred by words expressing the power of sacrificing. It is false, that the English do not acknowledge a Sacrifice in the sense of our best Divines, that is to say, *a representative and commemorative Sacrifice*, as it is called by their Lordships the Bishops of Belley and Meaux, Father Veron, the author of the Moral Theology of St. Augustine, and a number of others, who have best studied this subject. It is false, that in this sense, the English do not acknowledge in their Priests the power of sacrificing, and that their Ordination does not confer it. In a word, this whole reasoning is but a tissue of false suppositions and sophisms, which do not deserve that one should spend any long time in refuting them, for fear of embarrassing the principal question by so many foreign digressions.

I say, 1. that it is false, that Episcopal Ordination supposes the Sacerdotal conferred before; since, according to Bellarmine himself, both may be conferred by the same Consecration: *† Impossibile est ordinari Episcopum, qui antea non sit Presbyter, vel certe non tunc simul accipiat utramque Ordinationem; quia utraque est de essentiâ Episcopatus*: [It is impossible that a man should be ordained a Bishop, who is not a Presbyter before, or at least does not then at the same time receive both Ordinations: for both are of the essence of the Episcopate:] and because, according to St. Jerome^s, “In the Bishop is included the Priest also”: *In Episcopo et Presbyter continetur*. And in fact, it appears by several examples of antiquity, by the ancient Roman Orders of Service, by the reproaches of the Greeks, by the acknowledgment of the Latins, and even by the complaints themselves of some Popes, that the Episcopate was sometimes conferred without the Priesthood having preceded it; and even those who regarded these Ordinations as unlawful do not seem to have doubted of their validity. *‡ Nonnulli ex quacunque militia se ad Ecclesiam conferentes, says Pope Zosimus, statim saltu quodam summam locum Religionis affectant, qui gradatim per Ecclesiastica stipendia venientibus, explorata solet discussione differri: idcirco quoniam in nonnullis factum infirmare non possumus, si qui jam ordinati sunt, in eo gradu ad quem saltu subito pervenerunt, perdurare debebunt.*

First falsehood.

[†] De Ord. cap. 5.

[‡] Zosim. Ep. 7. ad Patrocl. Arelat.

^s Ep. 85.

CHAP.
XII.

[Some out of every profession betaking themselves to the Church, taking as it were a leap, aim at once at the highest place in Religion, a place which is accustomed to be delayed, men advancing step by step through the Ecclesiastical ranks of service, by a well-explored probation: wherefore since we cannot annul what in the case of some has been done, if any have already been ordained, it will be right that they remain in that rank to which they have suddenly come by a leap.] The examples of the Popes Sabinian, Constantine, Valentine, Nicholas the First, and some others, do not even leave us room to doubt, that this which Zosimus regarded as unlawful was become pretty frequent at Rome. And after such examples, I leave to the reader's judgment the truth and solidity of this proposition, that *the Episcopal necessarily supposes the Sacerdotal Ordination.*

Unfair as-
sumption.

But that which we cannot avoid censuring is, the making a Catholic dogma of a very false, or at least a very uncertain opinion, on which the Schools are divided, which learned Divines attack in the sight and knowledge of the Church, and which is opposed by examples, and by strong theological reasons, as it would be easy to prove, if I were not afraid of being carried into digressions foreign to the purpose.

Second
falsehood.

But let us suppose that true which is false, that the Episcopal does suppose the Sacerdotal Ordination, the author of the Memoire is none the nearer to his point. For how will the nullity of the English Priesthood be proved? It is, says he^u, because the English Ordination does not give the power to sacrifice. But where has he learnt that the Priesthood is conferred by the formula which expresses the power to sacrifice? There is not a single word said of it in the ancient Orders of Service, no more than in the Euchologies [and Rituals of the Greeks, the Syrians, the Copts, and generally speaking of all the Orientals. On this subject may be consulted the Collection of Father Martene^x, and it will there be seen, that it is only since about the eleventh century that we find the formula, “^yReceive power to offer Sacrifice to God, and to celebrate Mass as well for the living as for the

^u Journal &c. p. 729.

^x De Ant. Rit. tom. 2.

^y Accipe potestatem offerre Sacrifi-

cium Deo, Missamque celebrare tam pro vivis quam pro defunctis, in nomine Domini.

dead, in the Name of the Lord": a formula which has been drawn in only by the ceremony of the Chalice and the Paten; and independently of which the Priests were formerly very validly consecrated in the Latin, and are still at this day in all the Eastern Church. Accordingly Morinus and Martene scruple not to reject the opinion of those who would have this formula regarded as the form of the Priesthood, it being so modern as it is, and confined within the Latin Church alone.

The omission then of this formula in the Anglican Ritual cannot prejudice the Priesthood of the English; the less because they make no difficulty to allow the Sacrifice in the same sense with the greater part of the ancient Fathers, and of our most able controversialists, that is to say, *a representative and commemorative Sacrifice*, which is no ways different from that of the Cross, and which bears its name, because it is the image and memorial of it, and because the same Victim is there offered. This is very exactly allowed, among other learned English Divines, by William and John Forbes, Mason, Bishop Andrewes, Thorndike, Jos. Mead who wrote an express treatise on the subject, Grabe in his Notes on St. Irenæus, and many others; and I even dare assert that those among them who seem opposed to this doctrine, combat it only in opposition to the opinion of those of our Divines who maintain that in the celebration of the Holy Mysteries, there is a real immolation made, and that it is less the memory of the death of Jesus Christ than His death itself which is there renewed, an opinion which is founded only on ideas of little exactness and little authority.

"We have no objection, says the Bishop of Ely, to the term either of Sacrifice or of Oblation." ^{Andrewes.} *Nec a voce vel Sacrificii vel Oblationis abhorremus.* We offer, says John Forbes, the Sacrifice of Jesus Christ, not by immolating Him anew, but by making a memorial of His immolation, and praying God to make it propitiatory to us. ^{John Forbes.} *Ipsam Ejus (Christi) obedientiam cruentamque immolationem . . . offerimus Deo, non sacrificando Christum, aut de novo immolando, sed unicam illam, pro nobis in Passione semel factam, Christi immolationem commemorando; Deum suppliciter orantes, ut eam intuens nobis peccatoribus sit*

^z Apol. cont. Bellarm. c. 8.

Theol. l. xi. c. 20. § 25. [p. 575. Ed.

^a Joan. Forb. Instruct. Historico-

Amst. 1702.]

Third
falschgod.

CHAP.
XII.

propitius; non propter hanc nostram commemorationem, sed propter cruentam illam verè et propriè sacrificatoriam et propitiatoriam Oblationem, quam commemoramus Deoque offerimus Oblatione non sacrificatoriâ, sed commemorativâ, &c. [His (Christ's) very obedience and bloody sacrifice . . . we offer to God, not by sacrificing Christ, or immolating Him anew, but by commemorating that one immolation of Christ once made on the Cross for us; suppliantly beseeching God, that looking on it He would be propitious to us sinners; not for the sake of this our Oblation, but for the sake of that truly and properly sacrificatory and propitiatory Oblation, which we commemorate and offer to God not with a sacrificatory, but with a commemorative Oblation, &c.] Mason, Mead, and many others whom I might adduce, express themselves in the same manner. But not to enlarge here beyond my purpose, I will content myself with the testimony of Grabe. It is certain says this author^b, that St. Irenæus, and all the Fathers, as well those who had seen the Apostles as those who succeeded them, regarded the Eucharist as the Sacrifice of the new Law, and that they offered the bread and wine as sacred offerings; offering them to God before the consecration, as the first fruits of His creatures, to acknowledge His sovereign dominion over all things; and after the consecration, as the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, in order to represent the bloody Sacrifice offered on the Cross, and to obtain the fruits of His death for all them for whom it was offered. This is not, says he, the doctrine of one particular Church or Doctor, but of the Church universal. The Church had received it from the Apostles, and the Apostles from Jesus Christ. "*Atque hanc non privatam particularis Ecclesiæ vel Doctoris, sed publicam universalis Ecclesiæ doctrinam utquæ praxin fuisse, quam illa ab Apostolis, Apostoli ab ipso Christo edocti acceperunt, disertè—docet Irenæus, atque ante ipsum Justinus Martyr,*" et Clemens Romanus, Ignatius, Tertullianus, Cyprianus, et alii. ["And that this was not the private doctrine of a particular Church or Doctor, but the public doctrine and practice of the Church Universal, which she received from the Apostles, the Apostles received as the teaching of Christ Himself, Irenæus teaches distinctly, and before him Justin Martyr," and Clement

Mason,
Mead,
&c.

Grabe,

^b Not. in Iren. lib. 4. cap. 32. [p. 323.]

of Rome, Ignatius, Tertullian, Cyprian, and others.] Such is the language and doctrine of the English Divines, which implies an authentic acknowledgment of the Sacrifice of Jesus Christ, recalled and represented in the celebration of the Holy Mysteries; and nothing is more conformable to the language and doctrine of the Fathers, of our ancient Divines, and of our best controversialists.

St. Chrysostom, in his Homilies on the Epistle to the Hebrews, expresses himself after the same manner. ^c *Quid vero?* says he, *nos non quotidie offerimus? Offerimus quidem, sed Ejus mortem revocamus in memoriam: et ipsa una est, et non multæ. . . .* ^d *Pontifex noster Ille est, Qui illam obtulit Hostiam, quæ nos mundat. Illam nunc quoque offerimus quæ [et] tunc fuit oblata, quæ non potest consumi. Hoc fit in recordationem ejus quod tunc factum est. Hoc enim facite, inquit, in Meam commemorationem. Non aliam hostiam, sicut [tunc] Pontifex, sed eandem semper facimus, vel potius (Hostiæ seu) Sacrificii facimus commemorationem.* *μᾶλλον δὲ ἀνάμνησιν ἐργαζόμεθα θυσίας.* [But what? do not we offer daily? We offer indeed, but by commemorating (ἀνάμνησιν ποιούμενοι) His death: and it is one, and not many. . . . Our High Priest is He Who offered that Host which cleanses us. That we now also offer which then too was offered, which cannot be consumed. This takes place in remembrance of what then was done. For this do, says He, in remembrance of Me. We sacrifice not, as then the High Priest a different host, but ever the same; or rather we perform the commemoration of the (Host or) Sacrifice.]

St. Chry-
sostom.

Eusebius of Cæsarea expresses himself in still stronger terms, in order to shew that the Sacrifice which we offer is but a representative and commemorative Sacrifice. ^e *Itaque post omnia,* says he, *quasi mirabilem quandam Victimam Sacrificiumque eximium Patri Suo operatus pro nostra omnium salute obtulit; ejusque rei memoriam ut nos ipsi Deo pro Sacrificio offerremus instituit.* *μνήμην καὶ ἡμῶν παραδούς ἀντὶ θυσίας τῷ Θεῷ διηνεκῶς προσφέρειν. . . .* ^f *Igitur et sacrificamus et incendimus . . . memoriam magni illius Sacrificii, secundum ea quæ ab Ipso tradita sunt Mystèria celebrantes.* *καὶ θύομεν καὶ θυμῶμεν . . . τὴν μνήμην τῶν μεγάλων θύματος.* [After all things, therefore,

Eusebius
of Cæsarea.

^c Homil. 17. in Ep. ad Heb. [cap. 10. vol. 12. p. 168. Ed. Bened.]

^d [Ibid. p. 169.]

^e Demonstr. Evang. lib. i. c. 10. [p. 38. C. Ed. Par. 1628.]

^f [Ibid. p. 40. B. C.]

CHAP. XII. having wrought as it were a wonderful kind of Victim and an excelling Sacrifice to His Father, He offered It up for the salvation of us all; having appointed that we also should offer to God continually the memory of this as a Sacrifice. . . . Therefore we both sacrifice and offer as incense . . . the memory of that great Sacrifice, celebrating Mysteries according to those things which have been delivered by Himself.]

St. Augustine.

St. Augustine expresses himself in no different manner, since he teaches us, that Jesus Christ has left us the resemblance of His Sacrifice to celebrate. *g Ipse (Christus) est Sacerdos noster in æternum secundum ordinem Melchisedech, Qui Seipsum obtulit Holocaustum pro peccatis nostris, et EJUS SACRIFICII SIMILITUDINEM celebrandam in Suae Passionis memoriam commendavit; ut illud quod Melchisedech obtulit Deo, jam per totum orbem terrarum in Christi Ecclesia videamus offerri.* [Christ Himself is our High Priest for ever after the order of Melchisedek, who offered Himself as a Burnt-offering for our sins, and gave us to celebrate *the likeness of that Sacrifice* in memory of His Passion; so that what Melchisedek offered to God, we now see offered through the whole world in the Church of Christ.] But the expression he makes use of in his Books against Faustus is yet more remarkable, since he calls our Sacrifice the Sacrament of Memory. *h Hujus Sacrificii Caro et Sanguis ante adventum Christi per victimas similitudinum promittebatur; in Passione Christi per ipsam veritatem reddebatur; post adscensum Christi per SACRAMENTUM MEMORIÆ celebratur.* [Of this Sacrifice, the Flesh and Blood was promised before the coming of Christ by victims of likeness; in the Passion of Christ was given by the reality itself; after the Ascension of Christ is celebrated by *the Sacrament of Memory.*]

Fathers in general.

It is thus that the greater part of the ancient Fathers have expressed themselves; and it would not be difficult for us to increase the number of their testimonies, if this were the place to enlarge on this subject. St. Ignatius, Tertullian, St. Cyprian, and so many others, do not acknowledge a Sacrifice in the celebration of our Mysteries in any other sense; which has led St. Ambroseⁱ to say, that Jesus Christ

^g Liber de diversis quæstionibus 83, qu. 61. [vol. 6. col. 34. B, C. Ed. Bened.]

^h Lib. 20. contra Faustum, c. 21.

[vol. 8. col. 348. C, D. Ed. Bened.]

ⁱ De Officiis Ministrorum, lib. 1. c. 48. [vol. 2. col. 63. § 248. Ed. Bened.]

really offers Himself for us in heaven to His Father, but that upon our altars He is offered only in image: *Illic in imagine, ibi in veritate*. [Here in the image, there in the reality.]

Our old Divines have preserved the same ideas. For, The old Divines. not to heap together in this place a superfluous number of authorities, the Master of the Sentences, and St. Thomas, are of themselves sufficient to convince us of this. ^k *Dici potest*, Peter Lombard. says the former, *illud quod offertur et consecratur a Sacerdote, vocari Sacrificium et Oblationem, quia memoria est et representatio veri Sacrifici, et sanctæ immolationis factæ in ara crucis. Et semel Christus mortuus in Cruce est, ibique immolatus est in Semetipso; quotidie autem immolatur in Sacramento, quia* IN SACRAMENTO RECORDATIO FIT ILLIUS *quod factum est semel.* [It may be said that that which is offered and consecrated by the Priest is called a Sacrifice and Oblation, because it is the memorial and representation of the true Sacrifice and holy immolation made on the altar of the Cross. And once did Christ die on the Cross, and there was immolated in Himself: but daily is He immolated in the Sacrament, because *in the Sacrament there is a memorial of that which took place once.*] St. Thomas explains himself in a manner still stronger. St. Thomas Aquinas. ^l *Respondeo dicendum*, says he, *quod duplici ratione celebratio hujus Sacramenti dicitur immolatio Christi. Primo quidem, quia, sicut dicit Augustinus ad Simplicium, solent imagines earum rerum nominibus appellari, quarum imagines sunt: . . . Celebratio autem hujus Sacramenti . . . imago quædam est representativa Passionis Christi, quæ est vera Ejus immolatio. Et ideo celebratio hujus Sacramenti dicitur Christi immolatio.* [I answer that we must say, that in a double respect the celebration of this Sacrament is called the immolation of Christ. First indeed, because, as St. Augustine says to Simplicius, images are accustomed to be called by the names of those things whose images they are . . . but the celebration of this Sacrament is a kind of representative image of the Passion of Christ, which is the true immolation of Him: and hence the celebration of this Sacrament is called the immolation of Christ.] Others. Hugo de Sancto Victore, Nicolas Lyra, and the greater part of the

^k Lib. 4. Sentent. dist. 12. [p. 745. ^l Part 3. qu. 83. art. 1.
Ed. Moguntia, 1633.]

CHAP.
XII.

old Schoolmen thought no otherwise on this subject; and it is ill to the purpose that in the room of ideas so simple and so natural, persons would substitute explanations calculated only to create new difficulties, and to embarrass a subject which has already been the source of but too many divisions.

Various
controversialists.

Accordingly our best controversialists have taken no other way to explain this difficulty, nor found in the Eucharist any other than a representative and commemorative Sacrifice. Cardinal Gropper, Cassander, Barnes, Ferus, among the first, the Bishops of Belley and Meaux, as well as Father Veron and some others, among those that followed them, neither taught nor required the belief of any thing else. "Such is", says the late M. Bossuet in his Exposition of the Faith^m, "the Sacrifice of Christians, infinitely different from that which was practised under the Law; a spiritual Sacrifice, and worthy of the New Covenant; in which the Victim offered is perceived by Faith alone; in which the sword is the word that mystically separates the Body and the Blood; in which consequently this Blood is spilt only in a mystery, and in which the death takes place only by representation; . . . a Sacrifice of Commemoration, &c." The same thing may be seen in his Catechismⁿ, where he teaches that in this Sacrifice our Saviour "is immolated" only "in a mystical manner", and that it is "offered in commemoration of that of the Cross".

Bossuet.

Camus.

The Bishop of Belley^o had also taught before him, that the Sacrifice of the faithful is an "unbloody, representative, and commemorative" Sacrifice. Father Veron^p did not require that a man should believe more; and in his General Rule of the Faith he teaches clearly after Vasquez, that it is sufficient to believe that it is a "relative and commemorative" Sacrifice. These last testimonies ought not to be suspected by the author of the difficulties, and I do not think he will refuse them.

Veron.

Vasquez.

Observation.

I know that in other respects the Sacrifice of the Altar is called a real Sacrifice; but these are questions of names, concerning which Divines are not agreed, and which cannot autho-

^m P. 132. [Exp. de la Doctrine de l'Eglise Catholique, p. 69. Ed. 1681.]

ⁿ P. 234. [Œuvres, (Versailles, 1815.), tom. 6. p. 186.]

^o Avois[inement] des Prot[estants] &c.] p. 214.

^p Reg. Gen. p. 78.

rize a division in the Faith. Hence to exculpate the English, it suffices that they acknowledge with the Fathers and our best Divines, the Sacrifice of our Saviour recalled and represented in the celebration of the holy Mysteries; and we have seen by the testimonies given above, that they do acknowledge it in this sense. But since it is enough to acknowledge it in this sense, the supposition of the author is of course false in this respect also.

But moreover, since the English acknowledge the Sacrifice in a sense which our best controversialists think sufficient, it is of course false again, that they do not acknowledge in their Priests the power of offering such a Sacrifice, and that their Ordination does not confer it. For this power is included in that which is given them to administer the Sacraments, and to perform all the functions attached to the Priesthood of Our Saviour. But the celebration of the Eucharist has ever been regarded as one of the principal functions of the Priesthood; and it is certain, that before the introduction of the ceremony of the delivery of the Chalice and Paten into the Ordination of Priests, we were ignorant of any such idea as that of conferring particularly on the new Priest the power of offering the Sacrifice, and that even to this day it is not expressed in the Ordination of the greater part of the Orientals. Yet are they Priests none the less, and consequently the omission of such a form, or of an explicit designation of that function, cannot annihilate the Priesthood among the English, who use imposition of hands and prayer to ask the grace necessary to accomplish the duties of the Priesthood, "*for the Office and Work of a Priest*"; which takes in generally all the functions of that Order.

It is certain moreover, that according to the Ritual of Edward the Sixth, the celebration of the holy Mysteries is regarded as an essential function of the Priesthood. All the Rubrics of the Ritual persuade us of it; and we do not find that this part of the Sacerdotal Office was left to inferior Ministers. They acknowledge then this power in the Priests, and they believe that they confer it by their Ordination.

It is also certain, that Parker had been ordained Priest according to the Roman Pontifical, before his Episcopal Consecration. He had therefore received the power of offering the

CHAP. XII. Sacrifice. The Episcopate therefore was not conferred upon him in vain; and if he was validly ordained, the principal part of the question is terminated, since almost all agree that on the Ordination of Parker depends that of the other Bishops.

English
Priest-
hood
certain.

But be it as it may as to this Ordination, to make the Priesthood of the English certain, it is enough that the matter and form of the Sacerdotal Ordination they use may be regarded as including all that has ever been thought essential in that Ordination; and that in conferring it they exclude none of the powers which have ever been attached to the Priesthood of our Saviour; a thing which will appear certain to all those who will examine the matter without prejudice.

CHAP. XIII.

ANSWER TO THE SIXTH DIFFICULTY. THE RE-ORDINATIONS OF SOME ENGLISH BISHOPS CANNOT BE MADE TO PROVE THAT THERE WAS ANY THING ESSENTIAL WANTING IN THEIR ORDINATION.

Objection. ONE of the reasons which M. L'Abbé Renaudot advances against the validity of the English Ordinations, is, says he, that in the reign of Mary, the Catholic Bishops and most able Divines ordered, that the Bishops and Priests ordained according to Edward the Sixth's Liturgy should be re-ordained, and that they did not degrade those condemned to death, because they regarded them merely as laymen. It was the same in the reign of Elizabeth. The Catholics would never acknowledge as true Bishops those who had drawn their Ordination from Parker, and whatever division of opinion there may since have been on the validity of the English Ordinations, whenever any contest has arisen on this subject, or any English Minister has re-united himself to the Catholic Church, if he has been thought worthy to be admitted into the Clergy, all the Orders have been conferred upon him as upon a mere layman; and even quite lately such has been the practice at Rome.

Answer. I will not here dispute with M. L'Abbé Renaudot the

truth of the facts. It is certain, that in the time of Mary, the Bishops whom she caused to be condemned to death on the ground of heresy, were not degraded from the Orders which they had received according to Edward's Formulary: this is a certain and public fact. It is also certain, that under Elizabeth the English Catholics refused to acknowledge Parker as a Bishop, any more than those whom he had consecrated. Sanders, Stapleton, Harding, and all those who have written against the English, furnish authentic proofs of this; and it is in consequence of their conduct and their decisions, that at Rome this practice is still followed. But the question here is not to know what was done, but what ought to have been done; and it does not appear that the facts and the motives on which they determined ought to serve to determine us also.

Facts true.

For in the first place, the conduct observed in Mary's reign with respect to the degradations, was not very uniform. Had they acted by principle, it seems that they ought to have contented themselves without degrading those who had been ordained according to the new Formulary of Edward. For it is now agreed that those who were ordained under Henry the Eighth, or even under Edward before the change made in the Form of Ordination, were truly Bishops; and yet, several of these Prelates were not degraded from the Episcopate before they were sent to their last punishment. We find among others, Latimer Bishop of Worcester, Ridley Bishop of Rochester, and Farrar Bishop of St. David's. The first had been consecrated in 1535 under Henry the Eighth, and the other two under Edward in 1547 and 1548, before any change had been made in the Form of Ordination. Yet no one of them was degraded from the Episcopate, according to the testimony of the English writers. "About a fortnight forward," says Collier^a, "another Commission was issued from the Cardinal Legate, to White Bishop of Lincoln, Brooks Bishop of Gloucester, and Holyman Bishop of Bristol, or any two of them, to proceed to the degrading Bishop Ridley and Bishop Latimer, provided they could not prevail with them to recant. These Commissioners finding them firm to their former persuasion, and refusing to own any authority from the Cardinal

Uniformity not observed.

Ridley and Latimer.

^a Eccl. Hist. vol. 2. p. 385. [col. 1.]

CHAP. Legate, pronounced them guilty of heresy; and then de-
 XIII. claring they were no longer Members of the Church, con-
 signed them over to the secular Magistrate, to be punished
 as the law directs. They were only degraded from Priest's
 Orders. This was somewhat particular, since Cardinal Pool
 in his Commission styles them Bishops, and in case of ob-
 stinacy, directs their degradation from that character. And
 farther, White Bishop of Lincoln, one of the Commissioners,
 owns Ridley was made a Bishop according to the laws of the
 Church of Rome. But Brooks Bishop of Gloucester, who
 seems to have been the most bigoted Delegate, would allow
 neither of them to be any more than Priest."

Farrar. It was the same as to Farrar, by the testimony of the same
 author. ^b "Farrar Bishop of St. David's", says he, "was
 sent out of the world the same way. He was carried from
 London to Caermarthen, to stand the process: he was brought
 before his successor Morgan, who pronounced him an heretic
 for marrying after his being professed a religious; for main-
 taining justification by faith only; for denying Transubstan-
 tiation, and the propitiatory Sacrifice of the Mass. In the
 sentence he is styled a Priest, and degraded no farther.
 Bishop Farrar appealed from Morgan to Cardinal Pool, but
 that application was rejected."

Reordina- Reordina-
 tions. tions. This conduct proves clearly, that in this matter they did not
 act much by principles. In fact, as Burnet observes, they
 were not uniform in what they did on this head. ^c "One
 thing is remarkable, that it appears, both by these (Articles)
 and the Queen's Injunctions, that they did not pretend to re-
 ordain those that had been ordained by the new Book in
 King Edward's time; but to reconcile them, and add those
 things that were wanting; which were the anointing, and
 giving the Priestly vestments, with other rites of the Roman
 Pontifical. . . But now, though they only supplied at this time
 the defects which they said were in their former Ordinations,
 yet afterwards, when they proceeded to burn them that were
 in Orders, they went upon the old maxim, that Orders given
 in schism were not valid: so they did not esteem Hooper
 nor Ridley Bishops, and therefore only degraded them from

^b Collier, Eccl. Hist. vol. 2. p. 380.
 [col. 1.]

^c Burnet, Hist. Ref. vol. 2. p. 289,
 290.

the Priesthood, though they had been ordained by their own forms ^d, saving only the Oath to the Pope; but for those who were ordained by the new Book, they did not at all degrade them, supposing now that they had no true Orders by it."

The proof that they varied on this matter, and that at first they did not think of re-ordaining those who had been ordained even by the new Ceremonial, as Burnet justly observes, may be drawn from some documents found in the Collection of Records annexed to his history. Scarcely had Mary found herself fixed on the throne, when she sent an order to the Bishops to make, as early as possible, a visitation of their Dioceses, according to the Instructions which she sent them. In the fifteenth Article ^e of these Instructions, where the Ordination of Ministers is treated of, there is no mention made of re-ordaining them, but of supplying what they wanted. I subjoin the Article, such as it is given us. "Touching such persons as were heretofore promoted to any Orders, after the new sort and fashion of Orders, considering they were not ordered in very deed, the Bishop of the Diocess, finding otherwise sufficiency and ability in those men, may supply that thing which wanted in them before; and then, according to his discretion, admit them to minister."

Some pretend that by these words, "may supply that thing which wanted in them before", was meant not merely the supplying the ceremonies omitted in Edward's Ceremonial, but the supplying the Orders they received according to that Ceremonial; and the conduct observed as to the degradation of those who had been ordained under Edward, seems, according to them, to prove it. But this is the very question; and since their conduct was the same towards those ordained under Henry the Eighth, as to those under Edward, is it not more natural to believe, that it was not until afterwards that these Ordinations were looked upon as invalid? That which may make this credible is, that the term of supplying is never used for conferring Orders entirely, but simply for the ceremonies. This may be further confirmed by the twenty-ninth Article of the Visitation Questions prescribed by Bonner, and

^d Burnet mistakes as to Hooper, who had been ordained according to the new Ceremonial of Edward. Me-

morial of Cranmer, p. 254.

^e Collection of Records, vol. 2. p. 255.

CHAP.
XIII.
Bonner's
Visitation
Questions.

printed in the same Collection. ^f“ Whether any such as were ordered schismatically, and contrary to the old order and custom of the Catholic Church, or being unlawfully and schismatically married, after the late innovation and manner, being not yet reconciled nor admitted by the Ordinary, have celebrated or said, either Mass or Divine Service, within any Cure or place of this City or Diocess?” It is certain, that here those are included who were ordained in King Edward's time, seeing they are designated by these terms, “ordered—contrary to the old order and custom of the Catholic Church”: yet no more is directed than a reconciliation of the same nature as for those who had been either ordained during the Schism, or married unlawfully after their Ordination. They did not think, then, of re-ordination at first, and they regarded as validly ordained those who had been ordained under Edward.

Bull of
Julius III.

The plenary power given by Julius III. to his Legate Cardinal Pole, to reconcile England to the Church of Rome, and printed at the end of the translation of Burnet's History^g, is yet more direct and clear. For, speaking of the Bishops ordained in the time of Edward, there is no mention at all made of re-ordination, but simply of reconciling them to the Church, and of re-instating them. The passage, though rather long, is too important to be omitted. ^h*Necnon de personis quorumcumque Episcoporum vel Archiepiscoporum, qui Metropolitanam aut alias Cathedralis Ecclesias de manu laicorum, etiam schismaticorum, et præsertim qui de Henrici Regis et Eduardi ejus nati receperunt, et earum regimini et administrationi se ingesserunt, et earum fructus, redditus et proventus etiam longissimo tempore, tanquam veri Archiepiscopi aut Episcopi, temerè et de facto usurpando, etiamsi in hæresim, ut præfertur, incidierint, seu antea hæretici fuerint; postquam per te unitati Sanctæ Matris Ecclesiæ restituti exstiterint, tuque eos rehabilitandos esse censueris, si tibi aliàs digni et idonei videbuntur, eisdem Metropolitanis et aliis Cathedralibus Ecclesiis denuo, necnon quibusvis aliis Cathedralibus etiam Metropolitanis Ecclesiis per obitum vel privationem illarum Præsulum, seu aliàs quovis modo pro tempore vacantibus, de personis idoneis pro*

^f Collection of Records, vol. 2. p. 264. the Proofs.

^h Tom. 2. part 2. p. 1075. of the 12mo. Edition of Amsterdam, 1687.

^g This piece is found entire among

quibus ipsa Maria Regina juxta consuetudines ipsius Regni tibi supplicaverit autoritate nostra providere, ipsasque personas eisdem Ecclesiis in Episcopos aut Archiepiscopos præficere: Ac cum iis qui Ecclesias Cathedralis et Metropolitanas de manu laicorum etiam schismaticorum, ut præfertur, receperunt, quod eisdem seu aliis, ad quas eas aliàs ritè transferri contigerit, Cathedralibus etiam Metropolitanis Ecclesiis in Episcopos vel Archiepiscopos præesse, ipsasque Ecclesias in spiritualibus et temporalibus regere et gubernare, ac munere Consecrationis eis hactenus impenso uti, vel si illud eis nondum impensum extiterit, ab Episcopis vel Archiepiscopis Catholicis per te nominandis suscipere liberè et licitè possint. [Also concerning the persons of all Bishops or Archbishops who have received a Metropolitan or other Cathedral Churches from the hands of laymen, even of schismatics, and especially of King Henry and Edward his son, and have intruded themselves into the government and administration thereof, having also, as though they were true Archbishops and Bishops, temerarily and *de facto* usurped for a very long time the fruits, revenues and incomes, even though they have fallen, as is alleged, into heresy, or have been heretics before; after they shall have been restored by you to the unity of the holy Mother Church, and you shall have thought good to reinstate them, if in other respects they shall appear to you worthy and fit, to the same Metropolitan and other Cathedral Churches again, as also to any other Cathedral, even Metropolitan Churches, by the death or deprivation of their Prelates, or in any other way, vacant for the time being, concerning fit persons for which Queen Mary herself according to the customs of her kingdom shall entreat you by our authority to provide, and the same persons over the same Churches as Bishops or Archbishops to appoint: And with those who, as is alleged, have received Cathedral and Metropolitan Churches, from the hands of laymen, even of schismatics, that over the same or other Cathedral, even Metropolitan Churches to which they may happen to be in other respects lawfully translated, as Bishops and Archbishops they may freely and lawfully preside, and the same Churches in spirituals and temporals rule and govern, and the gift of Consecration already bestowed upon them use, or if it shall not

CHAP.
XIII.

yet have been bestowed, from Catholic Bishops or Archbishops by you to be named receive.]

Remarks.

1. Edward's Bishops.

This passage is better adapted than any other, to shew that the English Ordinations have not always been so ill thought of as by M. L'Abbé Renaudot. For, 1. it is certain, that the Bishops ordained under Edward the Sixth are here equally treated of with those under Henry the Eighth.

Et præsertim qui de Henrici Regis et Eduardi ejus nati (manu Ecclesias) receperunt, et earum regimini et administrationi se ingesserunt. [And especially who have received Churches from the hands of King Henry and Edward his son, and have intruded themselves into the government and administration thereof.]

2. Edward's Ritual.

2. There is no distinction made between the Ordinations performed according to the Roman Pontifical, and according to Edward's Ritual.

3. No re-ordination.

3. The Legate is permitted to re-establish all those who shall have been consecrated, without consecrating them anew.

Postquam per te unitati Sanctæ Matris Ecclesiæ restituti extiterint, tuque eos rehabilitandos esse censueris, si tibi aliàs digni et idonei videbuntur, . . . Cathedralibus etiam Metropolitanis Ecclesiis in Episcopos vel Archiepiscopos præesse, ipsasque Ecclesias in spiritualibus et temporalibus regere et gubernare, ac munere Consecrationis eis hæcenus impenso uti, . . . libere et licitè possint. [After they shall have been restored by you to the unity of the holy Mother Church, and you shall have thought good to reinstate them, if in other respects they shall appear to you worthy and fit, . . .

4. Illegal Ordinations. (Continuation of the Bull.)

over Cathedral, even Metropolitan Churches as Bishops and Archbishops they may freely and lawfully preside, and the same Churches in spirituals and temporals rule and govern, and the gift of Consecration already bestowed upon them use, . . .]

4. In order even to anticipate all difficulties, the Bull takes notice of the case of a Sacerdotal Ordination performed contrary to the laws, and gives the Legate power to dispense with it. *Nec non cum quibusvis per te, ut præmittitur, pro tempore absolutis et rehabilitatis, ut, eorum erroribus et excessibus præteritis non obstantibus, quibusvis Cathedralibus, etiam Metropolitanis Ecclesiis in Episcopos et Archiepiscopos præfici et præesse, illasque in eisdem spiritualibus et temporalibus regere et gubernare; ac ad quoscumque etiam sacros et Presbyteratús ordines promovere, et in illis, aut per eos jam licet*

minùs ritè susceptis Ordinibus, etiam in Altaris Ministerio ministrare, necnon munus consecrationis suscipere, et illo uti liberè et licitè valeant, dispensare etiam liberè et licitè possis, plenam et liberam Apostolicam auctoritatem per præsentem concedimus facultatem et potestatem. [Also with any who by you for

Bull of
Julius III.

the time have been absolved and reinstated as aforesaid, that their past errors and excesses notwithstanding, over any Cathedral, even Metropolitan Churches as Bishops and Archbishops they may freely and lawfully be appointed and preside, and the same in the said spirituals and temporals rule and govern; and to any, even sacred and Priestly Orders advance, and in the same, or Orders by them already, though irregularly, received, even in the Ministry of the Altar serve, and the gift of Consecration receive, and the same freely and lawfully use, that you may freely and lawfully dispense, we grant you by these presents full and free Apostolic authority, permission, and power.] For what could these words, *licitè minùs ritè susceptis Ordinibus* [Orders even irregularly received] mean, if not that in conferring the Priesthood, essentials excepted, which are always supposed, the ordinary laws of the Church were not observed? Nevertheless, under this hypothesis he permits the Legates to reinstate them, and these Priests thus reinstated to serve in their order, and to have Episcopal Consecration without receiving the Priesthood anew. Can there be any thing more direct on this head?

There is yet something more. For, if we believe Camden, notwithstanding all the changes made since the Reformation in the Offices and public Liturgy, Rome was so far from regarding them as essential, and consequently was so little decided on re-ordination, that one of the conditions which the Abbé Vincent Parpaglia, secret Envoy of Pius the Fourth to Elizabeth, offered on his part to that Princess, if she would return to his obedience, was that of approving her Liturgy, that is to say, the Book of Common-Prayer. ⁱ*Fama obtinet Pontificem fidem dedisse, . . . Liturgiam Anglicam sua auctoritate confirmaturum, . . . dummodò illa Ecclesiæ Romanæ se aggregaret, Romanæque Cathedræ Primatum agnosceret.* [It is reported that the Pope promised, . . . that he would confirm

Offer of
Pius IV.

ⁱ Annal. Eliz. part 1. p. 59. [p. 73, Ed. Hearne, 1717.]

CHAP.
XIII.

the English Liturgy by his authority, . . . provided she would join herself to the Church of Rome, and acknowledge the Primacy of the Roman See.]

General
deduction.

It is impossible, then, in order to prove the invalidity of the Ordinations made under Edward, to make any use of the re-ordinations prescribed in the reign of Mary, for two reasons. The first, because they were not uniform on this head, and because there was a time when they thought them valid, as appears from the Ordinances of Queen Mary, from the Visitation Articles of Bonner, and still more from the plenary power granted by Julius the Third to his Legate Cardinal Pole, and the offers made by Pius the Fourth to Queen Elizabeth. The second, that they equally charged with invalidity the Consecrations of Bishops made under Henry the Eighth, after his schism, as we see by the degradations of Latimer, of Ridley, and of Farrar, who had been consecrated according to the Roman Pontifical, and whom they were contented to degrade from the Priesthood only, on the pretext that they were not Bishops. But all agree now, that these Bishops were validly consecrated, and that their Consecration could not, without error, be taxed with invalidity. It is not surprising, therefore, that the same Divines were mistaken about Edward's Ordinations; and their opinion on this subject, or rather the re-ordinations made on such an authority, cannot even serve as an antecedent probability towards the decision of this question.

Opinions
founded
on false
facts.

No more can we rest on the opinions of those Divines who have enlisted themselves against the Ordinations performed under Queen Elizabeth; because their reasons depend on two facts absolutely false. The oldest of them rejected these Ordinations because, according to them, they had not been performed agreeably to the laws, and because those who had consecrated the new Bishops were not Bishops themselves. On the contrary, the argument of the later Divines is, that these Ordinations had validity only so far as the first had it, and that these first were indefensible, having been performed in a Tavern, without ceremony, without form, without solemnity, and contrary to all the laws.

If these two facts are false, they can be no foundation for any just reason for maintaining the necessity of re-ordinations.

But it is certain, and I think I have demonstrated in the second chapter, that the new Bishops were consecrated according to the laws, and that the history of the Tavern is a fable to which they have not even given such an air of truth as is necessary to pass it off. After what has already been said on this subject, it is very needless to enlarge upon it again; and I shall content myself with repeating in two words, that this fable is destroyed both by the silence of contemporary authors, and by its opposition to the public Registers, both by the contradictions found among those who have given it to the world, and by its inconsistency with itself; and lastly, by the fact that there was no necessity and no advantage for the Protestants to have recourse to such an Ordination, but on the contrary, every reason of wisdom, and even of human policy, are opposed to it. How then can such a story be maintained? and can we on such a foundation establish the necessity of re-ordination?

First fact
false.

The other fact is no less false. For to be ordained according to the laws, three things are necessary: a Minister duly consecrated, the essential matter and form, and a religious Formulary authorized by the national Church, which appoints her own rites. But all this is found in the Ordination of the new Bishops. The Consecrator had been consecrated, as has been demonstrated in the third, fourth, and fifth chapters. The essential matter and form were exactly preserved: we have seen this in the sixth and seventh chapters, where it has been proved at great length, that imposition of hands and prayer, which, as the best Divines agree, form alone the essence of Ordination, were strictly observed in the Consecration of Parker, and that the changes made in the Ritual could not alter the substance of the Consecration. In fine, the Rite of the Church prescribed by the laws in order to make a ceremony religious, was regularly observed in the same Ordinations; and it has been clearly proved in the eighth chapter, that these laws were already re-established when the new Bishops were ordained under Elizabeth; and if it sufficed to secure the validity of the Ordinations performed under Edward, we ought not to contest it with those made under Elizabeth.

Second
fact false.

I know that Stapleton, Harding, and other Catholic writers

Staple-
ton &c.

CHAP.
XIII.

contemporary with Parker, maintained to the faces of the new Bishops, that they were not truly Bishops; that their Consecration was chimerical; and that they could not make use of their Ordination, having received it from a man whose Ordination was equally indefensible.

Their rea-
sons.
(Harding.)
First.

It is very true that these Divines advanced all these things, and that they did it boldly; but, in truth, upon what reasons? It was, in the first place, upon this, that these Bishops had received their Ordination from Prelates who had embraced the Schism, as Harding says. ^k *Qui alios ordinare eo tempore præsumebant, erant ipsi omnino sine Ordine, ministrantes Ordines non secundùm Ecclesiæ Catholicæ ritum, quippe qui omnium Episcoporum in orbe Christiano Successionem abjicientes, novam congregationem propriæ suæ plantationis sibi erexerunt.* [“Those who took upon them to give Orders were

Second.

altogether out of Order themselves, and ministered them not according to the rite and manner of the Catholic Church, as who had forsaken the whole Succession of Bishops in all Christendom, and had erected a new Congregation of their own planting”.] The second reason was that Parker had not been ordained by Catholic Bishops. ^l *Dicis Episcopos vestros per Archiepiscopi triumque aliorum Episcoporum Consecrationem creatos esse, sed Archiepiscopus ipse quomodo, quæso, consecratus fuit? Et qui fuerunt tres illi in toto Regno Episcopi qui manus illi imposuerunt? . . . Nam Metropolitanus vester, qui omnium vestrum Consecrationes autoritate sua confirmare deberet, legitimam Consecrationem minimè obtinuit. . . . Fuerunt quidem in Regno Episcopi legitimi, qui vel non fuerunt requisiti manus vobis imponere, vel requisiti illud facere recusârunt.* [“Ye

Third.

were made (you say) by the Consecration of the Archbishop and other three Bishops. And how, I pray you, was your Archbishop himself consecrated? What three Bishops in the Realm were there to lay hands upon him? . . . For your Metropolitan, who should give authority to all your Consecrations, himself had no lawful Consecration. . . . There were ancient Bishops enough in England, who either were not required or refused to consecrate you”.] The last reason is, that they

^k Detect. errorum Juelli, [“A Detection of sundry foul errors,” &c. “uttered and practised by M. Jewel”,]

fol. 231. [See the Editor’s notes.]

^l Ibid. fol. 234.

preserved no more of the Pontifical than the imposition of hands and prayer, and retrenched or altered all that was not thought essential. ^m *Quod clarè demonstrat vos talem Consecrationem quæ in usu semper fuerat non quæsivisse, sed aliam novam, quam omnes antiqui Episcopi despiciebant.* [“Which is an evident sign that ye sought not such a Consecration as had been ever used, but such a one whereof all the former Bishops were ashamed.”] But are such reasons very suitable to convince us that Parker was no Bishop, and consequently all those also whom he had ordained? The two former would prove that no Bishops ordained in schism and heresy are validly consecrated; a doctrine which all Catholic Divines now allow to be false. The third, that a mere change of the Rite could alter the substance of the Sacraments: a pretence which falls to pieces of itself, and which the mere practice of the Churches refutes, without any necessity of enlarging upon it to shew its falsity.

There is moreover a thing of importance to remark. Almost all the Divines of those times were persuaded, that the essence of Ordination did not consist in the imposition of hands alone, but also in the unction, in the imposition of the book of the Gospels, and in the delivery of the instruments. This opinion is not even now so fully abandoned, as that some Schoolmen of our age do not, against all probability, maintain it. Persuaded as they were of the truth of this opinion, they could not think favourably of the validity of an Ordination in which, with the exception of imposition of hands and prayer, all the rest was omitted, although they thought it equally essential. And it was a necessary consequence, that they should not regard as Bishops those whose Ordination wanted parts which they considered absolutely necessary.

But now, when, being more enlightened in the knowledge of tradition, we doubt not that imposition of hands and prayer, joined to the rites prescribed by each Church in order to make this ceremony an act of religion, constitute the only essential matter and form of Ordination, can we draw a prejudice from the opinion of these Divines against the validity of the Ordinations made under Elizabeth? and ought we not,

^m Ibid. [fol. 234, 235. immediately after the preceding words.]

C H A P.
XIII.

on the contrary, to determine that they were mistaken, and that these Ordinations were quite valid? For, to conclude this answer in two words, we cannot employ against these Ordinations an opinion founded on false reasonings. But the opinion of the Divines who have opposed these Ordinations, is founded only on false reasons, or false facts; that is to say, either on the fable of the Nag's-head; or on the error of the necessity of re-ordaining those who have been ordained in schism or heresy; or lastly, on the false opinion which, besides imposition of hands, requires as necessary several ceremonies whose necessity is destroyed by all that is most authentic in the ancient Ecclesiastical monuments.

Practice at
Rome.

The only prejudice that remains for us to encounter, is the modern practice of the Church of Rome, which re-ordains all the English Ministers who re-unite themselves to the Catholic Church. This prejudice might indeed stop us, if in this affair we were to be determined by the respect due to an authority so venerable as that of the Church of Rome. But there are here two reflections to make. The first, that by the Bull of Julius the Third to Cardinal Pole, which we have cited above, it appears that the practice of the Church of Rome has varied on this head; and that she has not even yet any fixed and determined principle as to the particular point in question. The second, that there having been at Rome no new discussion, nor any juridical examination of this difficulty, the present usage cannot be used as a ground of argument, nor be made so to determine us, as that we should make this usage the rule of our decision.

Grounds.

There is even every reason to believe, that the conduct of that Church has varied on this head, only because the English Catholics will have sanctioned there the fable of the Nag's-headⁿ, and because they will have there published confidently, that the first new Bishops had not been consecrated by true Bishops: for we have seen, that the Catholic Divines contemporary with Elizabeth uniformly refused to regard as true Bishops, those who had not been ordained by the Catholic Prelates. These reasons, which could be destroyed only by

ⁿ What I advanced only as a conjecture, has very lately been confirmed to me by a letter of the learned M. Fontanini to one of my friends.

facts of which they were ignorant at Rome, and which the English did not much concern themselves to make known there, having once got the upper hand, it was impossible but that they should regard as invalid, Ordinations in which it was believed that all that was thought essential was omitted, and in which they found neither Minister, nor matter, nor form, which appeared admissible. It is on this same principle, that M. L'Abbé Renaudot, and those of our writers who have treated of this subject, have rejected the English Ordinations. But after the new clearing up of the facts, can a decision be defended, which is manifestly founded on false facts and frivolous principles?

But even supposing these facts, and the reasons on which the present practice of the Church of Rome is founded, were as solid as they are deficient in solidity, we could not even then make of the usage of that Church a rule which we ought to propose to follow blindly on this point, when we know that in this same matter, in other cases in which they ought to have had more light, they have not escaped being deceived. Every one knows the history of the Popes Formosus and Constantine. After the death of Formosus, Stephen the Sixth, his successor and his enemy, caused him to be disinterred, and at the head of his Council, having declared null the Ordinations which he had performed, caused all those to be re-ordained whom he had ordained. *o Cunctosque quos ipse ordinaverat, gradu proprio depositos iterum ordinavit.* [And all whom he had ordained, he deposed from their proper rank and ordained again.] John the Ninth annulled all that Stephen had done^v. Sergius the Third, who succeeded John^q, renewed all that Stephen had done against Formosus, and caused his Ordinations to be again declared null. But in fine, all was pacified under his successors, and no regard was had to the interrupted usage of that Church.

Something of the same kind had already happened with respect to Constantine. This Pope had been intruded into the holy See, and occupied it only a year and a month, during which time he performed several Ordinations. But

^o Luitpr. Diae. lib. i. hist. c. 8. (113), p. 118. Ed. Moguntiae, 1602.]
 [Luitprandus Diaconus Ticinensis de
 vitis Pontificum Romanorum, cap. ult. [^p See the Editor's notes.]
 [^q Not immediately.—ED.]

CHAP.
XIII.

Conc.
Rom.
A. D. 769.

Stephen the Fourth having been canonically elected, Constantine was shut up in a monastery, after they had had his eyes put out. It was afterwards deliberated what ought to be done with those whom he had ordained. It was resolved in a numerous Synod, where there were present even several French Bishops, who had been called to Rome upon this subject, that the Ordinations should be deemed null. *De Episcopis vero, atque Presbyteris et Diaconibus, quos ipse Constantinus consecraverat, ita in eodem Concilio promulgatum est,* says Anastasius the Librarian^r: *ut Episcopi illi, si aliquis eorum Presbyter aut Diaconus fuerit, in pristinum honoris sui gradum reverteretur; et si placabiles fuissent coram populo civitatis suæ, denuo facto decreto electionis more solito, cum Clero et plebe ad Apostolicam advenissent Sedem, et ab eodem Sanctissimo Stephano Papa benedictionis suscepissent Consecrationem; Presbyteri verò illi ac Diaconi ab eodem Constantino consecrati, simili modo in eo quo priùs existebant habitu reverterentur; et postmodum, si qui eorum placabiles extitissent, antefatus Beatissimus Pontifex Presbyteros eos aut Diaconos consecrasset.* [And concerning the Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons whom Constantine himself had consecrated, it was thus promulgated in the same Council: that of those Bishops, if any one had been a Presbyter or a Deacon, he should return to his original grade of honour; and if they were approved by the people of their city, that, the decree of election having been made anew after the accustomed manner, they should come with the Clergy and people to the Apostolic See, and from the same most holy Pope Stephen receive the Consecration of benediction; but that those Presbyters and Deacons whom the same Constantine had ordained, should return in like manner in that habit in which they had been before; and afterwards, if any of them were approved, that the aforesaid most blessed Pontiff should consecrate them Presbyters or Deacons.]

What may
justly be
inferred.

I agree that, as Auxilius has very well observed, we must never draw consequences from bad examples. *ⁿ Nunquam exemplum à malis est sumendum. Ex his enim quæ in voluminibus leguntur, ea solummodò imitanda vel facienda sunt,*

^r Anastas. in Steph. IV. [Rerum Italicarum Scriptores, tom. 3. p. 177. col. 1. C, D. Ven. 1723. See the Editor's notes.]

^s De Ord[inationibus] Form[osi], lib. 2. cap. 4. [3p. Morinum de Sac. Ord. part. 2. p. 363. col. 2. B.]

quæ bona esse probantur; mala autem penitus execranda sunt, et omnino cavenda. [We must never take example from bad things: for of the things which are read in books, those alone are to be imitated and done which are proved to be good; the bad utterly execrated, and altogether avoided.] Accordingly I do not pretend to make a law of what was practised on these two occasions; but on the contrary, simply conclude thence, that what is done at Rome is not always the rule of what we ought to do; and that since they decided wrongly with respect to the Ordinations of Constantine and Formosus, the practice which has been introduced there of re-ordaining the English Bishops may perhaps be neither more just, nor better founded; and that then, according to St. Augustine's maxim, more regard must be had to reason than to examples. † *Sana quippe ratio etiam exemplis anteponenda est.* [For sound reason is to be preferred even to examples.]

It will perhaps be said, that there is this difference between Objection. what was done at Rome with respect to Constantine and Formosus, and what is done with respect to the English; that in the two former cases they acted by passion, whereas in this last, they have but followed the Ecclesiastical rules; that moreover, Constantine and Formosus observed all that is prescribed for the administration of Orders, whereas the English have overthrown the whole form and all the ancient ceremonial prescribed and practised in the Catholic Church; and that whatever might be defective in what was done against the Ordinations of these two Pontiffs, becomes legitimate when applied to the re-ordinations of the English.

But whatever supposition be made, it is still certain that Answer. what has been done at Rome, is no certain rule for what we ought to do. The more favourably the cause of Formosus and Constantine is thought of, the more true my proposition is. For if they were mistaken there in cases in which there must have been less difficulty, it is not impossible that in this, in which the facts have been embarrassed, they should be deceived by the difficulty they have found in clearing up and being assured of the truth, which so many authors appear to have made it their business to obscure.

† De Civitate Dei, lib. 1. cap. 23. [cap. 22. § 2. tom. 7. col. 22. A. Ed. Bened.]

CHAP.
XIII.
—
Motives.

French
Bishops.
(Case of
Constantine.)

Sigebert.
(Case of
Formosus.)

Moreover, I do not know whether it is as certain as they say, that in the business of the re-ordinations directed in the cases of Formosus and Constantine, passion alone dictated these resolutions. It is true, that in Stephen the Sixth and Sergius the Third, there was in reality much animosity and passion: but is it equally certain that all the Bishops who had a hand in the decisions made in the Councils which they assembled, espoused all their hatred and animosity? Will it easily be believed, that the French themselves, who were called to the Synod held under Stephen the Fourth against Constantine, decided as they did merely from passion? And is there not more ground to think that this question not having as yet been very clearly determined, we ought not to be surprised, that they were mistaken at Rome on this subject, and that their opinions have been much divided thereon, as Sigebert in his Chronicle bears witness. “^u With much scandal there was much discussion and controversy agitated for many years in the Church, some rashly determining that his Consecration, and that of those ordained by him, ought to pass for null: others, on the contrary, deciding with sounder judgment, that what kind of person soever Formosus was, yet on account of the dignity of the Sacerdotal office, and the faith of those who had been ordained, all his Consecrations ought to be considered valid.” But be this as it may, it is enough for me to have proved by these examples, that the practice of the Church of Rome is at most only a prejudice, against which it is always lawful to object, and that nothing demonstrative can be concluded thence against the English Ordinations, any more than from what was done under Mary, and from what those English have thought, who have attacked the validity of the Ordination of Parker.

^u Cum multo scandalo multa per multos annos quæstio et controversia est agitata in Ecclesia, aliis ejus et ab eo ordinatorum Consecrationem irritam esse debere præjudicantibus, aliis è contra qualiscumque fuerit Formosus,

tamen propter Sacerdotalis officii dignitatem, et fidem eorum qui ordinati fuerant, omnes Consecrationes ejus ratas esse debere, saniori consilio judicantibus.—*Sigebert. Chron. ad Ann. 900.*

CHAP. XIV.

CONTINUATION OF THE SAME SUBJECT. THE RE-ORDINATIONS OF THE ENGLISH ARE CONTRARY TO ALL THE PRINCIPLES NOW RECEIVED IN THE SCHOOLS ON THE SUBJECT OF RE-ORDINATIONS.

WE have just seen that no use can be made against the validity of the English Ordinations, of the re-ordinations which have taken place of the Bishops ordained since the Reformation. I now go further, and I think it is easy to shew that these re-ordinations are contrary to all the principles at present received in the Church and in the Schools on this subject. It is certain that for a very long time persons did not know which side to take in the matter. The decision of the question which regards the reiteration of Baptism ought, one should think, to serve for a rule for those other Sacraments which, like this, are not reiterated. Nevertheless, many Divines were still in doubt, even to the twelfth and thirteenth century, whether an unlawful Ordination ought to be held as good, and some have denied it without hesitation.

Re-ordinations since the Reformation.

Former doubts.

But it must be acknowledged, that since that time, the opinion contrary to re-ordinations has so got the upper hand, that although it has not been defined by an express decree of the Church, it is regarded as almost belonging to the faith. This opinion, in fact, is built on reasons so solid, that it is difficult not to yield to them. For, 1. it is unanimously agreed, that every Sacrament which impresses *character*; that is to say, which carries with it a kind of Consecration, ought not to be reiterated; and on this point itself there never was any difficulty. There is no more difficulty to know whether Ordination imprints this character, since it has always been agreed that it does, and since it is this which St. Augustine brings to support the validity of Ordination as well as of Baptism. “^a As the baptized person,” says this

Now dispersed.

Reasons.

First received principle.

St. Augustine.

^a Sicut baptizatus, si ab unitate recesserit, Sacramentum Baptismi non amittit; sic etiam ordinatus, si ab unitate recesserit, Sacramentum dandi

Baptismi non amittit. Nulli enim Sacramento injuria facienda est.—*De Bapt. cont. Donat.* lib. 1. cap. 1. [§ 2. vol. 9. col. 80. A. Ed. Bened.]

CHAP.
XIV.
St. Augus-
tine.

Father, "if he departs from the unity, loses not the Sacrament of Baptism; so also he that has been ordained, if he departs from the unity, does not lose the Sacrament of giving Baptism. For we must not detract from any Sacrament". It is true that this Father speaks here of those only who had been ordained among the Catholics; but he goes farther than this in his Books against the Epistle of Parmenian; for he there shews that those even who have been ordained among the heretics, are validly ordained, as those who have been baptized in heresy, are validly baptized. ^b *Utrumque enim Sacramentum est; says he, et quoddam Consecratione utrumque homini datur; illud cum baptizatur, istud cum ordinatur; ideò-que in Catholica utrumque non licet iterari. Nam si quando ex ipsa parte venientes etiam præpositi pro bono pacis, correcto schismatis errore, suscepti sunt, et si visum est opus esse ut eadem officia gererent quæ gerebant, non sunt rursus ordinati; sed sicut Baptismus in eis, ita Ordinatio mansit integra: quia in præcisione fuerat vitium, quod unitatis pace correctum est; non in Sacramentis, quæ ubicumque sunt, ipsa sunt.* [For each is a Sacrament, and each is given a man by a kind of Consecration, the one when he is baptized, the other, when he is ordained; and hence it is not lawful in the Catholic Church to repeat either. For whensoever, for the good of peace, even the leaders, coming from the schismatic party itself, the error of their schism having been corrected, have been received, and it has been deemed expedient that they should bear the same offices which they bore before, they have not been ordained again; but as their Baptism, so their Ordination remained entire in them; because the fault, which was corrected by the peace of unity, was in the separation, not in the Sacraments, which wheresoever they are, retain their nature.]

Second
principle.

A second principle admitted in the Schools as indisputable on this subject is, that the conferring of a Sacrament out of the Church, does not render that Sacrament null, at least, when nothing is omitted which belongs to the essence itself of the Sacrament: but in this case, it would be this omission which would make the Sacrament null; not the conferring it out of the Church. This principle is a consequence of the

^b Lib. 2. cont. Ep. Parm. cap. 13. [cap. 28. tom. 9. col. 44. B, C. Ed. Bened.]

doctrine of the *character*: and though it has been contested in former times by those who did not allow the impression of any character out of the Church, there is now no further hesitation in admitting it, on the principles of St. Augustine against the Donatists, who proves to them that in every place where the Sacraments are, they ought to be recognised; *ubicumque sunt, ipsa sunt*; [wheresoever they are, they retain their nature;] and that the dissensions of men destroy not the gifts of God, according to Optatus: “^c And if the minds of men are at variance, the Sacraments are not.”

St. Augustine.

Optatus.

The third principle received by Divines is, that we must on this point reason of Ordination in the same manner as of Baptism. This maxim was not always universally received. Urban the Second would not admit of a parity between these two Sacraments. ^d*Alia in Baptismo*, says he, *et alia in reliquis Sacramentis consideratio est*. [The consideration is different in the case of Baptism and in that of the other Sacraments.]

Third principle.

Not always universally received. Urban II.

And Gratian, in his Decretal, expressly denies that any thing can be concluded from the one to the other.

Gratian.

^e*Patet ergo illud Augustini*, says he, *Sacramenta videlicet Christi per hæreticos ministrata suo non carere effectu, non de omnibus intelligi generaliter, sed de Sacramento Baptismi*. [It is clear that that saying of St. Augustine, viz. that the Sacraments of Christ administered by heretics do not fail of their effect, is to be understood not of all in general, but of the Sacrament of Baptism.] And, continuing in this same view, he adds, ^f*Patet quod Sacramenta Ecclesiastica præter Baptisma ab hæreticis ministrari non possunt*. [It is clear that the Church Sacraments with the exception of Baptism, cannot be administered by heretics.] And for fear it should be supposed that he meant this of a simple suspension, and not of an entire defect, of power, explaining what St. Augustine says, that the power attached to the character is not lost by schism, he maintains that St. Augustine speaks thus of those only who have received their Ordination in the Church, and not in the heresy or the schism. ^g*De his ergo qui accepta*

^c Et si hominum litigant mentes, non litigant Sacramenta. *Optat.* lib. 3. parag. 9. [p. 66. Ed. Dupin, Antw. 1702.]

[§ xxxv. tom. 11. col. 949. B. Col. Agr. 1609.]

^d Epist. ad Luc. S. Juv. præp. [Lucium Eccl. S. Juventii apud Ticinum præpositum,] apud Baron. An. 1099.

^e Decret. p. 2. c. 1. qu. 1. [Ed. Par. 1612.] can. 45.

^f ^g Can. 74. & 97.

CHAP. *Sacerdotali potestate ab unitate Catholicæ Ecclesiæ recedunt,*
 XIV. *loquitur Augustinus, non de illis qui in schismate vel hæresi*
positi Sacerdotalem unctionem accipiunt. [St. Augustine there-
 fore speaks of those who after they have received the Sacer-
 dotal power, depart from the unity of the Catholic Church,
 not of those who receive the Sacerdotal unction while placed
 in heresy or schism.]

Ancients
 thought
 otherwise.
 St. Augus-
 tine and
 Greg. I.

It must nevertheless be allowed that the ancients thought otherwise. For, besides what we have adduced from St. Augustine, St. Gregory the Great is very express. “^h But what you say,” writes he to John Bishop of Ravenna, “that he who has been ordained, should be ordained again, is very ridiculous, . . . Be it far, however, from you, my Brother, to think so. For as he who has once been baptized, ought not to be baptized again; so he who has once been consecrated, ought not to be consecrated again in the same Order.” The third

Concil.
 Carth. 3.
 A. D. 397.

Council of Carthage also makes the same comparison between the reiteration of Baptism and that of Ordination. ⁱ *Illud suggerimus mandatum nobis, quod etiam in Capuensi plenariâ Synodo videtur statutum: non liceat fieri rebaptizationes et reordinationes.* [We recommend to ourselves that order which in the full Synod of Capua is seen to have been decreed: let re-baptizings and re-ordinations be forbidden to be performed.] For the rest, the foundation of this comparison was very solid. For as what makes the price and value of the Baptism given in the Church, is that it is conferred in the Name of Jesus Christ, and that the faith or want of faith of the Minister neither adds to nor takes any thing away from the gifts of God, and the same reasons hold good with respect to Ordination, we must necessarily reason about the one as about the other. It is on this ground that Divines have returned to the maxims of St. Augustine and St. Gregory, and have altogether given up the doubts which formerly divided the Schoolmen on this head, as the Master of the Sentences remarks. ^k *Hanc quæstionem perplexam ac pene insolubilem*

Peter
 Lombard.

^h *Illud autem quod dicitis, ut is qui ordinatus est, iterum ordinetur, valde ridiculum est, . . . Absit autem à fraternitate vestrà sic sapere. Sicut enim baptizatus semel, iterum baptizari non debet; ita qui consecratus est semel, in eodem iterum Ordine non valet con-*

secrari. Greg. M. lib. 2. Ep. 32. [Ep. 46. tom. 2. col. 608, 609. Ed. Bened.]

ⁱ Can. 38. [Concilia, tom. 2. col. 1172 B, C. Ed. Paris. 1671.]

^k Lib. 4. dist. 25. [p. 830. Ed. Mo-
 guntia, 1632.]

faciunt Doctorum verba; qui plurimum dissentire videntur.

[This question is perplexed and rendered almost incapable of determination by the words of the Doctors, who are found to differ much in their opinions.]

A fourth principle allowed as certain is, that to reiterate a ^{Fourth principle.} Sacrament, there must either be a positive decree of the

Church, or a clear nullity, or at least a solid and evident doubt in the administration of the Sacrament itself. This principle follows from the preceding ones, and is founded on the very nature of the case. For if the reiteration of a Sacrament is a crime when that Sacrament has been validly conferred, it ought not to be performed except where the Church shall have determined by a solemn decree, that the first administration is null; or the thing is clear of itself; or lastly, the doubt is so solid, that we may apply to it the maxim of

St. Leo, that we are not accounted to reiterate, what is not ^{Leo the Great.} known to have been done. ¹ *Quod non ostenditur gestum, ratio non sinit ut videatur iteratum—quoniam non potest in iterationis crimen venire, quod factum esse omnino nescitur.*

[What is not shewn to have been done, reason forbids us to account repeated—since that cannot be accused of repetition which is not known to have been done at all.] But

to establish solidly a doubt of this kind, according to St. Leo, there must be neither proofs nor indications to conduct us to a knowledge of the thing. ^m “*Si nulla existant indicia*”—

si “*nemo sit penitus qui testimonio suo possit juvare ignorantiam nescientis.*” [“If there be no indications”—if “there be

no one at all who can help by his testimony the ignorance of him who does not know.”] For otherwise this doubt

will not be sufficient to authorize the reiteration of a Sacrament in other circumstances than the last extremity. ⁿ *Nisi forte supremus finis immincat.* [Unless perhaps the last end

be at hand.]

In fine, the last principle received as certain in the Schools ^{Fifth principle.} of this day is, that in Ordination, as in the other Sacraments,

there are many things which do not belong to their essence, and which may be omitted without consequence.

Morinus goes farther, and maintains without any proba- ^{Morinus.}

¹ Leo Mag. Ep. 2. [resp. 16.] et 135. [cap. 1. p. 717. Ed. Paris. 1675.]

[^m Ibid.]

[ⁿ Ibid. Ep. 135.]

CHAP.
XIV.
Opinion of
Morinus.

bility, that the ceremonies which have been added to those parts which are of the substance of the Sacrament, become themselves essential, by the choice which the Church has made of them. ° *In ritu Ordinationis sacræ*, says this Father, *quædam esse divinæ institutionis et traditionis, quæ omni Ordini sacro semper et ubique conveniunt, veluti manus impositio et oratio conveniens, quæ et Scriptura sacra nobis tradidit, et Ecclesiæ praxis semper et ubique usurpavit. Quædam vero Ecclesiasticæ institutionis, quæ licet mutari possint, et pro temporum et regionum varietate aliter atque aliter observari, tanti tamen sunt momenti, quamdiu ab Ecclesia revocata aut abrogata non sunt, ut eorum omissio Ordinationem reddat non modò inhonestam et illicitam, sed etiam irritam et nullam, omnique effectu et gratiâ cassam. Illa autem omnia ejusmodi conditiones sunt, materiam Sacramenti sic afficientes et determinantes, ut earum defectu materia reddatur Ordinationi inepta.* [That in the rite of sacred Ordination, some things are of divine institution and tradition, which belong to all holy Orders always and everywhere, as imposition of hands and suitable prayer, which both holy Scripture has delivered us and the practice of the Church has always and every where used. Some again of Ecclesiastical institution, which although they may be changed, and according to the variety of times and countries be variously observed, are yet of so great moment, so long as they are not revoked or abrogated by the Church, that their omission makes an Ordination not merely discreditable and unlawful, but also vain and null, and void of all effect and grace. But all those things are conditions of such a kind, so affecting and determining the matter of the Sacrament, that by their defect the matter is rendered unfit for Ordination.] But this opinion of Father Morin is ill supported, and there is scarcely any Divine who does not make an entire distinction between what is of the essence of the Sacrament, and what belongs properly to ceremony: a distinction which could have no place, if ceremonies prescribed by the Church became essential parts of Ordination.

Applica-
tion of
the prin-
ciples.

It is time now to proceed to the application of these principles, and shew that they are incompatible with the re-ordinations of the English ordained according to the Anglican Rite.

° Morinus de Sac. Ord. part. 3. Exerc. 5. cap. 9. [§ 1.] p. 104.

By the first principle, no Sacrament which imprints a ^{First and} character ought to be reiterated, even when conferred out ^{second.} of the Church; because, according to the second principle, the conferring of a Sacrament out of the Church does not render that Sacrament null, at least when nothing has been omitted which is essential thereto. But, according to the first principle, Ordination imprints a character; because, according to St. Augustine, it is a kind of Consecration similar to that of Baptism. ^p *Utrumque enim Sacramentum est; et quâdam Consecratione utrumque homini datur; illud cum baptizatur, istud cum ordinatur; idèdque in Catholica utrumque non licet iterari.* [For each is a Sacrament, and each is given a man by a kind of Consecration; the one when he is baptized, the other when he is ordained; and therefore it is not lawful in the Catholic Church to repeat either.] It is unlawful therefore to reiterate the Ordination of the English, unless at least it be proved that any thing essential is wanting therein; which it is impossible to prove.

For, by the fifth principle, we must distinguish, in the con- ^{Fifth.} ferring of the Sacraments, that which is essential from that which ought to be regarded only as a simple ceremony, and all does not belong alike to the substance. But it has been proved in the sixth and seventh chapters, that nothing essential was omitted in the Consecration of Parker, and that what was omitted ought not to pass for such.

It does not appear, then, that we can hesitate on this head; ^{Third.} the less, because by the third principle, we ought to reason about Ordination in the same manner as about Baptism. But if we reason about Ordination as about Baptism, it is evident, that we must allow the validity of the English Ordinations, not only because both alike imprint a character, but also because in the new English Ritual, the same retrenchments have been made in the administration of Baptism, as in that of Ordination. For as from Ordination they have cut away the Unctions, the imposition of the Book of the Gospels, the delivery of the instruments, and all that did not appear essential; in like manner have they cut away from the administration of Baptism, the Exorcisms, the Unctions, most of the signings of the Cross, the use of salt, and the greater

^p Lib. 2. cont. Parm. cap. 13. [See p. 246.]

CHAP.
XIV.

Applica-
tion of the
principles.

part of the other ceremonies, confining themselves to the mere immersion of the baptized, or the pouring the water on his head, joined to the words consecrated for the validity of that Sacrament. But the Baptism of the English is received, notwithstanding the retrenchments they have made of ceremonies certainly more ancient than all those used in Ordination. We cannot hesitate, then, as to the reception of their Orders, unless at least we have two weights and two measures in the judgment we pass on the things of religion.

Fourth.

If then there is any doubt on this subject, it can be only a doubt badly founded. But by our fourth principle, to reiterate a Sacrament, there must be either a solemn decree of the Church, or an evident visible nullity, or at least a solid and reasonable doubt; and this is what we do not meet with here.

No decree
of the
Church.

For 1. there is no decree of the Church that declares the English Ordinations null. It is true, that in some particular Churches it has been thought right, on the strength of false prejudices, to re-ordain those who have been ordained in England since the Schism; and that even at Rome this practice has been observed. But in all this we hear of no rule, and it has been done without discussing the question, without examining the facts, and because the most false and fabulous stories have been received as truths. Nevertheless, there is no prescription against truth; and it is never too late when the business is to make known the things of which persons were ignorant before.

No evi-
dent nul-
lity.

No more is there any evident nullity. The essential matter and form are found to have been used in these Ordinations. The public Records bear testimony to the publicity and solemnity of the ceremony. They there name the Consecrators, and detail all that was done, and all that was observed on the occasion. The imposition of hands, among the rest, and prayer, are there expressly related. There is therefore no evident nullity; and it is this which makes the greater part of those who contest the validity of the English Ordinations confine themselves to the doubt, and pretend that, being solid, it is sufficient of itself, without other nullities, to render the English Ordinations invalid, or at least, make us act with regard to those who have received this Ordination, as if it were really null and invalid. But we have shewn in the

twelfth chapter that this doubt, under the circumstances which accompany it, is not sufficient to authorize the re-ordination of the English, and does not prevent our falling into what St. Leo calls the crime of reiteration: *in iterationis crimen*.

The application of these principles is so easy and so natural, that I do not see on what side they can be destroyed. All agree, that Orders imprint a character; that the conferring of it out of the Church is not sufficient to hinder that impression; that in conferring a Sacrament, no regard ought to be had except to things essential, and to the Rite which makes it a religious ceremony; that in Ordination, imposition of hands and prayer, are the only essential parts, and that all this is found in the Ordination of the English Bishops. At what point then can the validity of these Ordinations be contested?

A man must necessarily resolve to take one of these two sides; and to maintain either that the essentials were not observed in the Ordination of the new Bishops, or that, to make Ordination valid, it is necessary to observe not merely what has been practised at all times and in all places, that is to say, not merely that which is in the Sacraments by divine or Apostolic institution, but also all that the Church has since thought fit to add to it, in such sort that is no longer permitted to any Church to change any thing therein. ^{Two alternatives.} *¶ Quædam verò Ecclesiastica institutionis, quæ licet mutari possint, et pro temporum et regionum varietate aliter atque aliter observari, tanti tamen sunt momenti, . . . ut eorum omissio Ordinationem reddat non modò inhonestam et illicitam, sed etiam irritam et nullam, omnique effectu et gratiâ cassam;* [Some again of Ecclesiastical institution, which although they may be changed, and according to the variety of times and countries be variously observed, are yet of so great moment, . . . that their omission makes an Ordination not merely discreditable and unlawful, but also vain and null, and void of all effect and grace;] as the learned Morinus teaches us.

But this alternative is incapable of being maintained in either of its parts. As to the first, it has already been shewn, in proving that King Edward's Ritual retained all that was essential of the Roman Pontifical, that is to say, the Minister, imposition of hands, and prayer; and that in the opinion of

[¶] Morinus *ibid.* [See p. 250.]

CHAP.
XIV.

the most learned Divines, none of the other ceremonies have either the antiquity or the universality necessary to entitle them to be regarded as essential parts of this Sacrament: that by the Record of Parker's Consecration, it is evident that these last parts alone were omitted; and that thus it cannot be proved that the essentials were not observed. All this has been demonstrated at such length, that it is needless to dwell longer upon it. But what we have to shew here in opposition to Morinus is, that the non-observance of the rest of the ceremonies, does not render an Ordination invalid, but simply unlawful.

Omission
of cere-
monies.

Morinus.

We might first quote Morinus against himself, asking him why, if he thinks the non-observance of the ceremonies prescribed by the Ritual or the Pontifical affects the validity of a Sacrament, why, I say, in speaking of the matters and forms in particular, he determines in what they consist, and distinguishes what belongs to the substance and what does not, as may be seen in the passages we have quoted in speaking of the imposition of hands and the formula *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum*, [Receive the Holy Ghost,] of which he says: *nullá ratione dici possunt (hæc verba) ad Ordinis substantiam pertinere*: [by no means can these words be said to belong to the substance of Orders.] For if the whole Rite together be of such importance, to use his own expressions, that the omission makes the Ordination not merely unlawful, but invalid, in vain would he distinguish what belongs to the substance from what does not; all, according to him, belonging alike, *quamdiu ab Ecclesia revocata ut abrogata non sunt*: [so long as they are not revoked or abrogated by the Church.]

Question
itself.

But without staying to reconcile this author with himself, it will be desirable to examine the matter independently of his opinion. Now, I ask whether there is any Divine who has thought that the rites approved by the Church, are in such sort essential to the validity of a Sacrament, that the matters and forms being employed without being accompanied by these rites, there is no Sacrament conferred? This proposition, which may be true in one sense, is absolutely false in that of Morinus, which is all I am concerned to confute; and as this requires to be developed, we must see in what sense it may be true or false, in order to be able to apply it justly.

Distinction
of cases.

In order that a Sacrament may be conferred, to the matter and form must be joined the intention. All agree in this. There is a dispute in the Schools as to the interior or exterior intention; but this does not concern us here, where the exterior intention is sufficient for us. This exterior intention is manifested by the practice and observation of the religious Rite prescribed by the Church, and we cannot otherwise judge of it. When in certain circumstances this Rite is omitted, we may pronounce with full assurance, that the intention is wanting, and this judgment is neither false nor rash. It is precisely under these circumstances that the proposition of Morinus is true, that the omission of the Ecclesiastical ceremonies renders the Sacrament null; because, as he judiciously observes: “^rBut all those things are conditions of such a kind, so affecting and determining the matter of the Sacrament, that by their defect the matter is rendered unfit for Ordination.” For as the intention is essential to the Sacrament, and as this is not otherwise manifested than by the observation of the ceremonies prescribed, the omission consequently causes a nullity.

1. Intention.

The omission of the ceremonies may happen in another case, which is that of necessity. This necessity may arise from different accidents: at one time it will be the peril of death, at another the want either of Ministers, or even of those things which are the material of the ceremonies; sometimes the fear of a persecution; in a word, all that can give the idea of a just necessity. Admitting this, it appears to me that it cannot be doubted that the proposition of Morinus is false; and I know of no Divine who has been willing to maintain in this case, that the omission of the ceremonies rendered a Sacrament null. There are even occasions, in which, without any necessity, the omission of the ceremonies does not make Sacraments null, when the intention to do what the Church does is otherwise manifested; and this proves that the case of defect of intention alone, can render the observation of the ceremonies essential to the Sacrament.

2. Necessity &c.

^r Illa autem omnia ejusmodi conditiones sunt, materiam Sacramenti sic deficientes et determinantes, ut earum defectu materia reddatur Ordinationi inepta. *Ibid.*

CHAP. XIV. Some examples will tend to clear up this matter, and will serve to decide the difficulty.

Baptism. In the administration of Baptism, the water is the matter, and the invocation of the Holy Trinity, in whatsoever manner enounced, whether in the form of prayer, or in that of a wish, or in that of a command, is the form. If a person in sport baptizes another, that is to say, if he pours water upon him, invoking the Holy Trinity, this Baptism will none the less be looked upon as null, because the non-observance of the ceremonies of Baptism proves in these circumstances, that the intention did not accompany the application of the matter and form. On the contrary, the omission of the ceremonies of Baptism in an imminent peril of death, does not hinder the Baptism from being received as valid: and even apart from the case of death, although one cannot but regard as an evident abuse the delay of the ceremonies of Baptism in order to render the solemnity more august, as it often happens to the children of great lords, it has never been doubted that such a Baptism was good, although conferred without the ceremonies which ought to accompany it; because in this case the intention was sufficiently manifested, and there was no doubt in the matter.

Orders. In like manner in Ordination, we know how urgent and strict are the Ecclesiastical laws which require three Bishops for the Consecration of a Bishop. This law is at least as ancient, as general, and as urgent, as those which prescribe the Unctions, and the other ceremonies which accompany Ordination. And yet in a hundred instances, when necessity has required it, the Ordinations performed by one alone have been allowed as good; which would have been rejected as null, if the neglect of this law had afforded ground to believe that the intention of the Consecrator was not that of the Church. The practice therefore of the Church, which receives as good and valid Sacraments administered without all the ceremonies prescribed, entirely decides against Morinus, and proves that the retrenchment of the ceremonies may take place without affecting the validity of the Sacraments; and this in fact is the opinion of all Divines.

Bishops
ordained
by one
Bishop
only.

3. Church authority. There is a third case in which the omission of the ceremonies may take place. It is when the Church in general

thinks it desirable to make alterations therein, or to take them away altogether; or when a particular Church thinks it necessary not to keep to the Rite received for a long time, and makes therein all the changes or retrenchments she pleases, though preserving still what has always been thought essential. In this case, the omission of the ceremony does not alter in any manner the validity of the Sacrament, as we have seen in the tenth chapter; and Morinus himself freely allows it, in speaking of the necessity of the ceremonies. Admission
of Mori-
nus. “^sHence it follows,” says he, “that the matters of those Sacraments may be different in different Churches, and that Matrimony, Absolution, and Ordination administered in some places may be null and void, which if they had been performed in the same manner, and with the same circumstances in other places, would have been valid and lawful, supposing those conditions and circumstances to be, as we assume, according to the usage of that Church, commanded as substantial. For every one is bound to follow the custom of the Church in which he lives, unless he has obtained licence from one who has authority.” But to suppose that a Church may change the rites she has been using, is not this to allow plainly that she may authorize the omission of the ceremonies, without prejudicing the substance of the Sacrament?

In these two cases it is plain that the maxim of Morinus is entirely false; and it is astonishing, that he has not restrained it to the sole case of the ceremonies being necessary to manifest the intention of the Church. But what has led him into this error is a second maxim, equally variable with the former, namely, that the Church may prescribe conditions on which the validity of a Sacrament so depends, that without them it should not be thought conferred. Cause of
his error:
a second
maxim. “^tThe Church,” says he, “as it appears to me, has power to determine under

^s Hinc sequitur, Sacramentorum materias in diversis Ecclesiis posse esse diversas, atque Matrimonium, Absolutionem, Ordinationem quibusdam in locis celebrata, irrita esse et nulla, quæ si eodem modo et eum iisdem circumstantiis facta fuissent aliis in locis, fuissent rata et legitima, dummodo conditiones illæ et circumstantiæ, ut assumimus, sint ex usu illius Ecclesiæ et substantiales imperatæ. Unusquisque enim Ecclesiæ in qua vivit morem

sequi tenetur, nisi licentiam à potestate habente sit consecutus. *Morin. Ib. p. 105.*

^t Ecclesia meo iudicio definire potest quibus conditionibus ordinans Episcopus autoritate suâ uti debeat, quibusve eum donis et qualibus ordinandus sese ordinanti sistere, ut validè et efficaçiter ordinem ab eo recipiat; ita ut si ordinans aut ordinandus definitionem hanc neglexerint, contraque egerint, actio sit nulla et irrita, atque ut effectus producat, iteranda. *Ibid. p. 104.*

CHAP.
XIV.

what conditions the ordaining Bishop is to use his authority, and with what and what kind of gifts the person to be ordained to present himself to the ordainer, in order that he may receive from him a valid and effectual Ordination; in such sort that if the ordainer, or the person to be ordained neglect this definition, and act in opposition to it, the act may be null and void, and in order to produce the effect, require to be reiterated."

This only
partially
true.

As this maxim is true in certain respects, it is by the application which may be made of it, that we must determine whether it suits the particular case treated of. It does not belong to me to wish to decide as to what the Church can or cannot do. But what concerns us to consider at present is, whether the Church, before having declared that she lays down conditions without the observation of which she will not regard as valid the Sacraments that shall be conferred, can declare null those Sacraments in which the matter and form which have always been thought essential shall have been preserved. Whether, for example, she can declare null a Baptism administered without any of the ceremonies prescribed, except the use of the water, and the invocation of the Holy Trinity, with the intention of doing what the Church does. This is exactly our case, and on this it is that we have to decide, and the decision does not appear very difficult.

For according to the fifth principle above established, we must distinguish between what is essential, and what does not belong to the substance of a Sacrament. But before the declaration of the Church, at least, we cannot regard as belonging to the substance of the Sacrament those conditions which the Church has not prescribed under the penalty of declaring the Sacrament null. This proposition, which alone can cause any difficulty, is allowed by Morinus himself, when he says, that the Church may declare on what conditions she chooses that a Sacrament shall be received efficaciously; that is to say, that the conferring of it shall be valid. It is this declaration, therefore, which renders the conditions necessary or not; and that which has been done before, it is not in the power of the Church to declare null.

Further
argument.

And in fact, if the case were not so, to what purpose so many disputes as have been raised in the Church on the subject of the validity of the Sacraments received in heresy

and schism? Nothing, it appears to me, would have been more easy to put an end to. The Church had but to declare them null, and from that very time they would have been so, without running the risk of reiteration; a thing which has always appeared odious and criminal in the Church. But this was never the maxim of our Fathers: all their attention related only to the substance of the Sacrament, that is to say, what was prescribed by Jesus Christ or His Apostles. If they found that there, they did not think that the Church could annul what Jesus Christ had established; and we do not find, for example, that on the subject of Baptism, there was ever question of any thing else besides the use of the water joined to the invocation of the Holy Trinity, without making any difficulty as to whether the other ceremonies had been observed.

The instances of Matrimony and Penance alleged by Morinus, have no relation to the particular case treated of; Matrimony and Penance. for, besides that these two Sacraments imprint no character or Consecration, which makes an essential difference; we have to remark further that Marriage is not merely a Sacrament, Matrimony. but consists also of a civil and a natural contract; that it is in these two respects that the Church, or even the Prince, interposes, because it concerns the interest of society to follow certain laws, without which families would be brought into a dangerous confusion; that if the validity of the contract be prevented, the Sacrament can have no place,—for the Sacrament supposes the union, which there cannot be between persons whom the laws hinder from contracting together; in a word, that these persons may certainly receive the Rite of the Sacrament, but producing no effect upon them, it is null whenever it is unlawful, as is the case with all those Sacraments which do not impress character. The Church has changed nothing with respect to the matter and form; she has not made of the ceremonies which have been added, an essential part of this Sacrament; but as in order to render all other contracts valid, it is necessary to follow certain laws, it is the same in the case of Marriage; and if these laws are not observed, the Sacrament has no effect, in consequence of the defect in the subject, whom the laws render incapable of contracting.

CHAP. XIV.
 Penance. It is nearly the same with Penance. The Church has added nothing either to the matter or to the form. The ceremonies which accompany the administration of this Sacrament, are essential no further than as they serve to manifest the intention of the performer to do what the Church does, as has been remarked. There is nothing more at this day belonging to the substance of the Sacrament than what belonged to it formerly; I mean to say, the imposition of hands and the formula of Absolution, whatever that may be. But as the Sacrament cannot be conferred without Ministers and without subject, it is necessary that the Church declare who are the subjects and the Ministers of this Sacrament, in default of which the Sacrament is null; because the only effect of this Sacrament being the grace, and grace not being conferred by a Sacrament which is administered or received unlawfully, there remains nothing but the symbol; and it is null, without the Church's having added any thing essential to the matter or the form.

Result. These two examples, then, do not prove that the Church can make the ceremonies which she prescribes become essential parts of a Sacrament; but still less would they prove that the ceremonies which she has not proposed as essential could become such by the subsequent declaration she might make after the administration of the Sacraments. This is founded neither on authority nor on reason. All the examples of sound antiquity are contrary to it; and if in the particular fact of Ordination there has been more variation, the conduct of the re-ordiners has at length been declared contrary to the principles and spirit of the Church.

Negative argument. But this is exactly our case; and to put the English Ordinations out of the reach of any reproach, we have but to prove, that they cannot shew any decree of the Church, either formal, or even equivalent, which has declared that the ceremonies annexed to the imposition of hands and prayer, should be regarded as so many essential parts of the Sacrament of Orders, and that they belonged to its substance. But the proof of this is easy, since it consists in a negative, which cannot be destroyed, but by producing such a decree, which never existed.

Positive. But there is more. It can even be shewn by positive

proofs, that the Church has never regarded these ceremonies as an essential part of the Sacraments to which they are joined, since the Council of Trent took pains, as far as it could, to fix what appeared essential in the Sacraments, but represented the rites and ceremonies only as things laudable, which might not be omitted or despised without fault. “^uIf any one shall say, that the received and approved rites of the Catholic Church, accustomed to be used in the solemn administration of the Sacraments, may be either despised, or without sin omitted by Ministers at their pleasure, or by any Pastor of the Churches changed into other new ones, let him be anathema.” It is thus that the same Council expresses itself, whenever it wishes to make it understood that a Sacrament is administered unlawfully, but not invalidly; and were this not the case, it had been easy to add that the rites were essential, and to make its anathema fall upon those who should say that without them the Sacraments were valid. But no Divine has understood it in this sense, nor do we find any one who ventures to maintain the necessity of the ceremonies for the validity of a Sacrament.

Council of
Trent.

I do not think any one disputes this, that there is not in fact any such decree as would be necessary to make the ceremonies essential to the validity of the Sacraments. But it will perhaps be said, that the Church having declared null the Ordinations performed according to Edward’s Ritual, this was declaring in a manner equivalent, that the ceremonies of the Pontifical were necessary; or at least, that if they did not annul the Ordinations already performed, they declared sufficiently that those which should be made according to that Form, should be reputed absolutely invalid.

Objection.

This in fact is what may be said with the most plausibility on this head; but, unfortunately, it is not true that there has been such a declaration on the part of the Church with respect to the Ordinations performed according to the Ritual of Edward; and we have seen on the contrary, in the thirteenth chapter, that there was at first much variation in the matter,

Answer.

^u Si quis dixerit receptos et approbatos Ecclesiæ Catholice Ritus in solemnæ Sacramentorum administratione adhiberi consuetos, aut contemni, aut sine peccato à ministris pro libito omitti,

aut in novos alios per quemcumque Ecclesiarum Pastorem mutari posse, anathema sit. *Concil. Trid. Sess. 7. de Sacram. in genere*, can. 13.

CHAP. and that even at Rome, Julius the Third seems to have
 XIV. allowed their validity. It is true that under Mary, they afterwards had those re-ordained who had been ordained according to Edward's Rite. But can we call this a decree of the Church? and can the opinion of some Bishops, soured by their unjust deposition, and interested to lower those who had oppressed them on the ground of their adherence to the old Religion, and besides this, animated with a zeal which was perhaps but little enlightened in defence of the truth,—can this pass for a rule, and for an universal law which we are bound to respect?

Further
 obser-
 vation.

Besides, as the Church did not pretend to innovate in this matter, and as since that time it has not been thought that the ceremonies which accompany Ordination are more requisite for its validity than before; even though they should produce a decree of the Church, which certainly does not exist, we should still have to enquire whether such a decree had not been made, not with a view to the omission of the ceremonies, but rather under the false persuasion of certain facts which had been given her as true, though in reality they were very false. For, as the Church, by the general consent of all Divines, is by no means infallible in this kind of facts at least, a decision founded on such a persuasion would always be liable to re-examination, and it would never be too late to shew its weakness and injustice. But we are not in this difficulty: the Church has passed no decree, and the modern usage of Rome cannot pass for such. It is not on the strength of such an usage that we ought to reform the rules: but, on the contrary, it is to the rules that we must bring this usage, in order to compare it with, and reform it by them. So far nothing obliges us to think otherwise of the English Ordinations, than of those of the other heretics and schismatics, which have been allowed to stand. And since the principles of the Church and of the Schools on the subject of re-ordinations, apply equally to both, and we find in all the essence of Ordination, we should be wrong, it would seem, in passing a different judgment upon them.

CHAP. XV.

CONTINUATION OF THE SAME SUBJECT: HOW MUCH THE CHURCH HAS VARIED WITH RESPECT TO RE-ORDINATIONS. REFLECTIONS ON A PRINCIPLE PROPOSED BY MR. THORNDIKE TO FIX THESE VARIATIONS, AND TO REGULATE THIS MATTER. IT IS NOT UPON THIS PRINCIPLE THAT THE CHURCH HAS HITHERTO REGULATED HER CONDUCT ON THIS HEAD.

If the principles on the subject of re-ordinations which are now unanimously received in the Church and in the Schools, had always been adopted as the rules that ought to be followed, we should not have seen so many disputes, nor so many scandals caused by unlawful re-ordinations, as we have seen, especially in the middle ages. But it must be allowed, that these principles have had their times and their vicissitudes, as most things in this life; and we cannot avoid, when we see these variations, owning the justice of that reflection of M. Pascal's; "a A meridian, or a few years of possession, decides concerning truth. Fundamental laws change. Right has its epochs. Amusing justice, which a river or a mountain bounds! Truth on this side of the Pyrenées, error on that!"

This however would be much less surprising, if this question were regarded only as one of discipline, as some have done in treating of the reiteration of Baptism; and as it seems in fact natural enough to do. But be this as it may, our business here is only to shew, that the principles on which we rest for the non-reiteration of Sacraments, have not always been admitted with the same unanimity as they are at this day.

These principles properly reduce themselves to two; for the other three do not relate so directly to the subject, and may consist with reiteration. These two principles are, 1. That the administering of a Sacrament out of the Church does not make that Sacrament null. Secondly, that we must

^a Un méridien décide de la vérité, ou peu d'années de possession. Les loix fondamentales changent. Le droit a ses époques. Plaisante justice, qu'une

rivière ou une montagne borne! Vérité au-deçà des Pyrenées, erreur au-delà! *Pensées de Pascal*, chap. 25. § 5.

Vicissitudes of principles.

Observation.

Principles reducible to two.

C H A P.
XV.

reason about Ordination as about Baptism. But these two maxims have been much disputed, and the history of the debates which have arisen on the subject of different Ordinations proves this fact, as is easy to shew.

Vicissitudes of the first as applied to Baptism.

St. Cyprian.

1. It was not always agreed, that the conferring of a Sacrament out of the Church did not render that Sacrament null. On the contrary, all the reasons of St. Cyprian, and of the Churches of Africa, were founded on this principle, that out of the Church there was no true Sacrament. Men, says St. Cyprian, not becoming Christians but by Baptism, and Baptism having neither fruitfulness nor holiness except in the Church, how can he have God for his Father, who has not also the Church for his mother? ^b *Cùm nativitas Christianorum in Baptismo sit, Baptismi autem generatio et sanctificatio apud solam Sponsam Christi sit, . . . ubi, et ex qua, et cui natus est, qui filius Ecclesiæ non est, ut habere quis possit Deum Patrem ante Ecclesiam matrem?* [Since the nativity of Christians is in Baptism, and the generation and sanctification of Baptism is with the Spouse of Christ alone, . . . where, and of whom, and to whom has he been born, who is not a son of the Church, that a man should be able to have God for his Father before he has the Church for his mother?] There is but one God, says the same Father, one Christ, one hope, one faith, one Church, one Baptism, and this Baptism is found in the Church alone. ^c *Traditum est nobis quòd sit unus Deus, et Christus unus, et una spes, et fides una, et una Ecclesia, et Baptisma unum, non nisi in una Ecclesia constitutum.* [It has been delivered to us that there is one God, and one Christ, and one hope, and one faith, and one Church, and one Baptism, established in the one Church alone.]

In his Letters to Jubaian, Firmilian, and others, the same Saint repeats every where the same principle, and argues that nothing is conferred out of the Church, because out of the Church is preserved neither right nor power to bestow any thing of what belongs to the Church. ^d *Qui (hæretici), foris positi, et extra Ecclesiam constituti, vindicant sibi rem nec juris sui nec potestatis (cùm Baptismum conferunt): quod nos nec ratum possumus nec legitimum computare, quando hoc apud eos esse constet*

^b Cypr. Ep. 74: ad Pompeium. [tom. 1. p. 250. Ed. Wirceburgi, 1782.]

^c Ibid. [p. 253.]

^d Ep. 73: ad Jubaianum: p. 231.]

illicitum. [Who (the heretics), being placed without, and situated outside the Church, claim to themselves a thing which is neither of their right nor of their power (when they confer Baptism): which we cannot judge either valid or lawful, since among them it is certainly illicit.] This opinion was common to him with the whole Church of Africa, as appears by the Council of Carthage which he caused to be held upon this subject. African Church.

There is no true Baptism but in the Church, says Felix ^e of Misgirpa. ^f *Non est Baptisma nisi in Ecclesia unum et verum: ... Nam quæ foris exercentur, nullum habent salutis effectum.* [There is no Baptism except the one and true Baptism in the Church. . . . For those which are performed without have no effect of salvation.] The Church and Heresy are two opposite things: if Baptism is with us, it cannot be with the heretics, and *vice versa*, says Januarius Muzulensis. ^g *Ecclesia et hæresis duæ et diversæ res sunt. Si hæretici Baptisma habent, nos non habemus; si autem nos habemus, hæretici habere non possunt.* [The Church and Heresy are two distinct things. If the heretics have Baptism, we have it not; but if we have it, the heretics cannot have it.] “Either the Church is the Church, or Heresy is the Church. But if Heresy is not the Church, how can the Baptism of the Church be found among the heretics?” says Pelagianus of Luperciana. ^h *Aut Ecclesia Ecclesia est, aut Hæresis Ecclesia est. Porrò si Hæresis Ecclesia non est, quomodo esse apud hæreticos Baptisma Ecclesiæ potest?* — It is clear from all these reasonings, that the principle of which we are now so well persuaded is the very one which was most contested; not merely by the Africans, which is not surprising, but also by the greater part of the Orientals, Januarius Muzulensis. Pelagianus of Luperciana. Orientals. even those posterior to the Council of Nice.

I speak not here of Firmilian, whose principles every one knows: but St. Athanasius, St. Cyril of Jerusalem, St. Basil, and some others, all regarded this principle as very dubious; being persuaded that a Sacrament administered in heresy was no Sacrament at all. *Soli hæretici rebaptizantur*, says St. Cyril [† of Jerusalem,] ⁱ *siquidem prius illud non erat Baptisma.* [Heretics alone are rebaptized, since that former St. Cyril of Jerusalem.

^e See the Editor's notes.]

^f *Cum non sit* &c. Conc. Carth. ap. Cyprian, tom. 2. p. 106.]

[^g ^h Ibid. p. 114. 115.]

ⁱ Cyril. Hierosol. in præf. Cateches. [§ 4. p. 6. Ed. Oxon. 1703.]

C H A P. Baptism was no Baptism at all.] Which is also the opinion of
 XV. St. Basil, whatever some Divines have thought. "Ἐδοξε τοίνυν
 St. Basil.] τοῖς ἐξ ἀρχῆς, says he in his first Canonical Letter to Amphi-
 lochius^k, τὸ μὲν τῶν αἵρετικῶν (βάπτισμα) παντελῶς ἀθετήσαι
 . . . οὐ γὰρ ἐβαπτίσθησαν οἱ εἰς τὰ μὴ παραδεδομένα ἡμῖν βαπ-
 τισθέντες· ὥστε εἰ καὶ τὸν μέγαν Διονύσιον τοῦτο παρέλαθεν,
 ἀλλ' ἡμῖν οὐ φυλακτέον τὴν μίμησιν τοῦ σφάλματος. [It
 seemed good therefore to those of the earliest times to reject
 altogether that of the heretics; . . . for they have not been
 baptized, who have been baptized into those things which
 have not been delivered to us. Wherefore even if this escaped
 the observation of the great Dionysius, we however must not
 keep up the imitation of the error.]

Ordina-
 tion.

Innocent
 the First.

But if they spoke thus of Baptism, I leave it to be supposed
 what they thought of Ordination conferred in heresy. For,
 as we have already pointed out in the preceding chapter, even
 those who received the Baptism of heretics, did not therefore
 ratify their Ordination. Innocent the First is distinct, what-
 ever pains be taken to give him another meaning: for he
 says positively in one of his Letters, that their Baptism alone
 was received: ¹*Solum Baptisma ratum esse permittimus.*
 [Their Baptism alone we allow to stand good.] I know it is
 pretended, that Innocent the First speaks only of the exer-
 cise of Orders, which they suspended in those who returned to
 the Church: but assuredly the reasonings of this Pope cannot
 be thus restrained, without doing them too great violence. ^m*At
 dicitur,* says this Pontiff, *vera ac justa legitimi Sacerdotis
 benedictio auferre omne vitium quod à vitioso fuerat injectum.*
Ergo, si ita est, answers he, *applicentur ad Ordinationem sacri-
 legi, adulteri, atque omnium criminum rei; quia benedictione
 Ordinationis crimina vel vitia putantur auferri. Nullus sit
 pœnitentiæ locus, quia id potest præstare Ordinatio, quod longa
 satisfactio præstare consuevit.* ["But it is said," says this
 Pontiff, "that the true and right benediction of the lawful
 Priest removes every fault which by the faulty one had been
 introduced. Therefore, if this be true," answers he, "let
 sacrilegious persons, adulterers, and those guilty of every

[^k Can. 1: Conciliorum tom. 2.
 col. 1717 A, C. Ed. Labbei et Cos-
 sartii Paris. 1671.]

¹ Innocent. I. Ep. 18. [§ 3, *ibid.* col.
 1269. D.]

^m *Ibid.* Ep. 22. [§ 4. col. 1274 B.]

crime be brought to Ordination; because by the benediction of Ordination crimes or faults are supposed to be removed. Let there be no room for penance, because Ordination is able to perform that, which long satisfaction has been accustomed to perform.”] It is certain that this passage cannot be interpreted of any thing but re-ordination, since these heretics would not have been purified but by the same Sacrament which would have purified the adulterers and the sacrilegious. But this Sacrament, according to Innocent, is no other than Ordination; *quia benedictione Ordinationis crimina vel vitia putantur auferri*: [because by the benediction of Ordination crimes or faults are supposed to be removed.] And besides this, what reasonable sense can one give to these words, That he who has nothing can give nothing, *“Nihil in dante erat, quod ille posset accipere*, [There was nothing in the giver which the other could receive,] except that that Ordination imprinted no character on him who received it, and that it attributed to itself an authority which it had not: *“Rei sunt usurpatæ dignitatis, qui conficiendorum Sacramentorum sibi vindicaverunt^p auctoritatem*. [They are guilty of usurping dignity, who have assumed to themselves the authority of performing the Sacraments.]

The second Council of Saragossa, held in the year 592, expresses itself nearly to the same purpose. It is on the subject of the Arians, whose Baptism it ratifies, but whose Ordination it will have reiterated. *“Placuit sanctæ et venerabili Synodo*, says this Council, *ut Presbyteri qui ex hæresi Ariana ad sanctam Catholicam Ecclesiam conversi sunt, qui sanctam et puram fidem atque castissimam tenuerint vitam, acceptam denuò benedictionem Presbyterii sanctè et purè ministrare debeant*. [It has pleased the holy and venerable Synod, that those Presbyters who have been converted from the Arian heresy to the holy Catholic Church, who shall have maintained the holy and pure faith and a most chaste life, having received anew the benediction of the Priesthood, should minister it in a holy and pure manner.]

It is certain, that this benediction can here be nothing but Ordination; for the imposition of hands either in Penance or

[ⁿ Ibid. § 3. col. 1274 A.]

[^o Ibid. § 5. col. 1275 E.]

[^p Ed. Labb. *vindicaverunt*.]

[^q Can. l. [tom. 5. col. 1600 C.]

C H A P.
XV.

Cone.
Rom.
A. D. 769.
Suession.
II. 853.

Oriental
Law.

in Confirmation, was never called by this name, *Presbyterii benedictio*, [the benediction of the Priesthood.] The Council of Rome held on business of Constantine, and that of Soissons assembled for that of Ebbon, reason on the same principle, and make the same difference between these two Sacraments.

We have in the Oriental Law two answers which confirm the difference which the ancients made between Baptism and Ordination given in heresy. The first is that of a Patriarch of Constantinople, consulted by Martyrius Patriarch of Antioch on the validity of Ordination. For speaking of heretical Clerks, whose Baptism was admitted, he says, ^r *μεταταῦτα ὡς σπουδαῖοι λαϊκοὶ χειροτονοῦνται ἐκεῖνο ὃ ἦσαν παρ' αὐτοῖς τὸ πρότερον· εἴτε πρεσβύτεροι, εἴτε διάκονοι, κ. τ. λ.* [After these things, as good laics, they are ordained what they were before in their own Sect; whether Presbyters, or Deacons, &c.]

Balsamon. The other is Balsamon's, who being consulted by a Patriarch of Alexandria, ^s *An Sacerdos vel Diaconus hæreticus, dignus habitus divino et sancto Baptismate, vel per sanctum Chrisma sanctificatus, possit sacra facere cum priore Ordinatione suâ? An vero si sacra ministrare velit, iterabitur ejus Ordinatio?* [Whether an heretical Priest or Deacon thought worthy of the divine and holy Baptism, or sanctified by the holy Chrism, may minister in virtue of his former Ordination? Or whether, if he wishes to perform the sacred functions, his Ordination shall be repeated?] answers in distinct terms, that (whether his Baptism be repeated, in case the former was null, or he be received by the Unction, supposing the former Baptism valid,) ^t 'if he be thought worthy not merely of the Priestly, but also of the Episcopal dignity, his first Priesthood being accounted as a sacrilege, and as not conferred, he shall rise altogether by the usual degrees to the Doctorial height,' that is to say, to the Episcopal dignity. But it is evident by these two answers adduced by Morinus^u, that in the East as well as in the West they made a great difference between Baptism and Ordination, and that they did not conclude the validity of the one from that of the other, as we now do.

^r Lib. 4. Jur. Orient. [Juris Græco-Romani, Francofurti, 1596.] p. 290.

^s Ibid. lib. 5. p. 378, 379. [See the Editor's notes.]

^t Si dignus censeatur non modò Sacerdotalis dignitatis, sed etiam Episco-

palis, priore Sacerdotio pro sacrilegio habito, et pro non facto, omniò per consuetos gradus ad Doctoriam sublimitatem ascendet.

^u De Sacr. Ordin. part. 3. Exercit. 5. cap. 7. [§ 1, 5.] p. 98.

We have already seen that Urban the Second also recognised this difference, avowing that we ought not to reason of the other Sacraments as of Baptism. ^x *Quia alia in Baptismo, et alia in reliquis Sacramentis consideratio est; quippe cum et ordine prior et necessarius sit.* [Because the consideration is different in the case of Baptism and in the case of the other Sacraments; seeing it is both prior in order and more necessary.] This also was the opinion of several Divines in the time of Cardinal Peter Damian, as appears by one of his Treatises, in which he teaches clearly that according to them the Ordinations of the Arians ought not to be allowed as valid, although their Baptism was admitted. ^y *Ubi notandum,* says he, *quanta invocationi divini nominis reverentia debeat, cum et ab eis baptizati quos tam perfida, ut ita dixerim, fides damnat, rebaptizari tamen omnino non audeant.* [Where we must take notice, how great reverence is due to the invocation of the Divine name, when even persons baptized by those whom (so to speak) so perfidious a faith condemns, dare not at all be re-baptized.] And yet, when speaking of the Ordination conferred by these heretics, he adds: ^z *Quia igitur virtutem Sancti Spiritus in fide non habent, qua videlicet omnis Ecclesie dignitatis ordo perficitur, apud eos facta Ordinatio canonicis sanctionibus irrita judicatur.* [Because therefore they have not the virtue of the Holy Spirit in faith, that by which the rank of every Ecclesiastical dignity is produced, the Ordination performed among them is adjudged void of Canonical sanction.] It is true he is not of this opinion himself; and notwithstanding what Morinus says^a, lays down clearly, in the thirtieth and thirty-first chapters of the same little work, that we ought to pass the same judgment on Baptism as on Ordination, as appears by the mere titles of these two chapters. “^bThat re-baptizing and re-ordaining is an equal crime. That as no one can be re-baptized, so no one can be ordained anew.” But this work at least shews that all did not reason in the same way on this subject; and this is precisely the whole which we have proposed to prove.

Urban II.
Others
noticed
by Peter
Damian.

^x Epist. ad Lucium. [See p. 247.]

^y Petr. Dam. Opusc. 6. c. 22. [Opera tom. 3. p. 55. B. Romæ, 1615.]

^z [Ibid. p. 54. F.]

^a De Sac. Ord. part. 3. Ex. 5. c. 2.

^b Quod rebaptizatio et reconsecratio par crimen est.—Quod sicut rebaptizari, ita et denuo consecrari quisque non potest. [Tom. 3. p. 59, 60.]

CHAP.
XV.

Facts.

But the recital of the facts and examples which are found in the history of the Church on this subject, affords yet better proof than the words of the ancient authors, though distinct enough, how much variation there has been about this matter. It is true that bad examples can never stand for a rule; *c* *Nunquam à malis sumendum est exemplum*, as Auxilius said: accordingly we do not pretend to make a law of these examples, but only to draw from them a convincing proof of the variation there has been on the subject of re-ordinations.

Council
of Nice:
A.D. 325.

I speak not here of the eighth Canon of the Council of Nice. As it is somewhat obscure, it cannot be brought in as a proof; and though it appears to me that it cannot be reasonably interpreted of any thing but re-ordinations, I will not insist on a testimony of which we know not from other sources the manner of the execution. Nevertheless it appears that the Greeks were always inclined to the idea of re-ordination; and the single example of the Ordinations of Maximus the Cynic, declared null by the first Council of Constantinople, seems to decide it. For Balsamon and Zonaras do not hesitate to interpret in this sense the decree of that Council. “^dTherefore this holy Synod,” says Balsamon^e, “deposed him (Maximus), defining that he neither was nor had been a Bishop, because he had been elected in an illicit manner; and that those who had been ordained by him, of what degree soever, were not Clerks.” Which agrees with the words of the Canon^f, which, according to an ancient version, says: *omnibus scilicet quæ circa eum vel ab eo gesta sunt, in irritum revocatis*: [all things, in fact, which had been done with respect to him or by him having been declared null.]

Second
General
Council:
A.D. 381.

Case of
Photius:
ordained
A.D. 858.

The example of Photius and of his Ordinations, is very similar to that of Maximus. It is for this reason that Adrian the Second would have him treated in the same manner; and Anastasius the Librarian, after Adrian, gives a convincing

[^c See p. 242.]

^d Ἡ σὺν ἀγίᾳ σύνοδος αὐτῆ ἀπεκήρυξε τοῦτον (τὸν Μάξιμον), ὀρίσασα μὴτε ἐπίσκοπον αὐτὸν γενέσθαι ἢ εἶναι, διὰ τὸ ἐκθέσμως χειροτονηθῆναι, μὴτε τοὺς ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ χειροτονηθέντας οἰουδήτινος βαθμοῦ κληρικοὺς εἶναι.

[^e On Can. 4: Beveregii Synodicon, sive Pandectæ Canonum &c. p. 91

B C. Oxon. 1672. The Scholion of Zonaras follows immediately that of Balsamon.]

^f Can. 4. [Can. 6. in the version referred to: v. Conc. tom. 2. col. 959 A B. Ed. Paris. 1671. The Canon is given in the original *ibid.* coll. 947, C D. and in the Editor's notes.]

reason; which is, that the Ordination of both is very nearly the same. *Quia Photius Maximo*, [says Adrian the Second^g,] Adrian II.
et Ordinatio ejus, . . istius Ordinationi penè in cunctis videtur esse simillima. [Because Photius to Maximus, and the Ordination of the one, . . to the Ordination of the other, appears in almost all things to be very similar.] *Sciendum est*, says Anastasius the Librarian.
Anastasius^h, quia Photius tamquam neophytus et adulter, qui scilicet Ecclesiam viventis invaserit, nunquam fuisse Episcopus dictus et promulgatus est: sed nec ii qui ab eo manûs impositionem acceperunt: comparati videlicet Maximo Cynico, et ordinatis ab eo, a secunda Synodo cum ordinatore repulsis. [It must be understood, that Photius, as a novice and adulterer, one, that is to say, who had invaded the Church of a living person, was said and publicly declared never to have been a Bishop: nor yet those who from him had received imposition of hands: being compared, in fact, to Maximus the Cynic, and to those ordained by him, who, together with their ordainer, were rejected by the second Synod.] It appears, in fact, that the Latins acted with Photius, as if he had conferred nothing. For we see that they consecrated the Churches which he had already consecrated; that they gave Confirmation to those to whom he had already administered it; and that Photius, by way of reprisal for what had been done, had on his part re-ordained those who had been ordained by Ignatius: τὸν ὑπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου τετελεσμένους ἐπειρᾶτο ἀναχειροτονεῖν, [those consecrated by the saint he endeavoured to re-ordain,] says Nicetasⁱ: which proves that they had also re-ordained those who had been ordained by Photius; that this was in consequence of the decrees of Nicolas the First, who, in his letter Nicolas I.
to the Emperor Michael, declares that Gregory of Syracuse could ordain no one: ^k *elusus quemquam ordinare nequivit*: [having been struck out, he could ordain no one:] that his prayer could not be heard, and consequently that he conferred nothing: ^l *si non audibilis, ergo inefficax: si inefficax, profecto Photio nihil præstans*: [if such as could not be heard, therefore inefficacious: if inefficacious, certainly conferring nothing

[^g Ep. 4, ad Ignatium, *ibid.* col. 1012 C: see also col. 898 C—E.]

[^h Scholion at the end of his Edition of the Eighth Council: *ibid.* col. 1176 A.]

[^l Life of Ignatius: *ibid.* col. 1256 D.]

[^k Ep. 9: Conc. tom. 8. col. 335. D E.]

[ⁱ *Ibid.* col. 336 A.]

CHAP. XV.
Adrian II.

on Photius:] that Photius having nothing, could give nothing, as Adrian the Second says: ^m *nihil habuit, nihil dedit, nisi forte damnationem habuit, quam se sequentibus propinaverit*; [he had nothing, he gave nothing, unless perhaps he had damnation, of which he drank first and passed the cup to his followers;] and that it is for this reason that they ought not to be regarded as Clergymen or as Bishops whom Photius had ordained: ⁿ *Quos idem Photius in gradu quolibet ordinasse putatus est, ab Episcoporum numero vel dignitate, quam usurpativè ac fictè dedit, meritò sequestrantes*: [those whom the same Photius is thought to have ordained in any degree, from the number and dignity of Bishops, which he in an usurped and fictitious manner gave, deservedly sequestrating:] which agrees with the sense of the fourth Canon of the eighth Council, which annuls all that Photius had done: ^o *Omnibus, maximè quæ in ipso et ab ipso ad Sacerdotalis gradus acceptionem vel damnationem acta sunt, in irritum ductis*: [all things, especially the things which in him and by him were done with respect to the receiving or condemning of the Sacerdotal rank, being made void.]

Eighth
General
Council,
(fourth of
Constantinople):
A.D. 869.

Observation.

It is true we may suspect all these expressions of exaggeration, and imagine that they regarded only the suspension of acting in those who had been ordained; and that this is so much the more probable, because in the reconciliation which was made between Photius and the Church of Rome, under the Popedom of John the Eighth, no mention was made of re-ordaining either Photius or those whom he had ordained.

Temporary reconciliation under John VIII. A.D. 879.

^p *In Pontificali officio Comministrum, atque . . . in Pastoralis magisterio Consacerdotem, pro Ecclesiæ Dei pace et utilitate, . . . recipimus*. [We receive him . . . as a fellow-Minister in the Pontifical office, and . . . in the Pastoral government a fellow-Priest, for the peace and advantage of the Church of God.] This is certainly distinct: but may we not suspect that the same thing happened in the case of Photius as afterwards in that of Formosus, in which his Ordinations were first reputed null, and afterwards valid? For how otherwise

Variations.

[^m Ep. 4. (see note g): *ibid.* col. 1012 D. (see also *Harduini Concilia*, Paris. 1715, tom. 5. col. 794 D.)]
[ⁿ *Ibid.* col. 1012 C.]

[^o *Conc.* tom. 8. col. 1128 E.]
[^p *John VIII. Ep.* 199. *ibid.* col. 1455 A. and tom. 9. col. 131 E.]

can we reconcile John the Eighth with Adrian the Second, who makes an essential difference between those who had been ordained by Photius, and those who after their Ordination had taken his side? ^a *Eos . . . in suis gradibus confirmantes*, says he, speaking of these, *ignoscendum decrevimus*: [confirming them . . . in their ranks, we have determined to pardon them:] whereas he absolutely rejects the others, as having received nothing but their own condemnation, as we have seen. This may be taken as a new proof that as yet they had no fixed principle whereby to judge of the validity or nullity of Ordinations.

This variation, or at least, this uncertainty, is yet infinitely more evident in the facts relating to Constantine, to Ebbo, and to Formosus. We cannot deny, with any appearance of truth, that there were on these occasions, real re-ordinations; and to wish to force every thing in order to reconcile them with the present practice, is to make the clearest passages of no use to convince us of any truth. We see on one side, that in the affair of Constantine, Stephen the Fourth caused a Synod to be held at Rome, and that it was there determined that the Bishops, Priests, and Deacons ordained by that intruder should be reduced to their former degree, and after a new election be consecrated again. ^r *In eodem Concilio*, says Anastasius, *promulgatum est, ut Episcopi illi (quos ipse Constantinus consecraverat), . . . in pristinum honoris sui gradum reverterentur*; “*et si placabiles fuissent coram populo civitatis suæ, denuo facto decreto electionis more solito, cum Clero et plebe ad Apostolicam advenissent Sedem, et ab eodem Sanctissimo Stephano Papa benedictionis suscepissent Consecrationem; Presbyteri verò illi ac Diaconi ab eodem Constantino consecrati, simili modo in eo quo prius existebant habitu reverterentur; et postmodum, si qui eorum placabiles extitissent, antefatus Beatissimus Pontifex Presbyteros eos aut Diaconos consecrasset. . . .* ^s *Ita enim in eodem Concilio statutum est, ut omnia quæ isdem Constantinus in Ecclesiasticis Sacramentis ac divino cultu egit, iterata fuissent, præter sacrum Baptisma, atque sanctum Chrisma.*” [In the same Council it was promulgated that those Bishops (whom Constantine himself had consecrated), . . . should return to their

Other cases.

Case of Constantine.

[^a Adrian II. Ep. 4. (see p. 270.): ^r Anast. in Steph. IV. [See p. 242.]
ibid. col. 1013 C.] [^s Ibid. col. 2 A.]

CHAP. XV. original grade of honour; “and if they were approved by the people of their city, that the decree of election having been made anew after the accustomed manner, they should come with the Clergy and people to the Apostolic See, and from the same most holy Pope Stephen receive the Consecration of benediction; but that those Presbyters and Deacons who had been consecrated by the same Constantine, should return in like manner in the habit in which they were before; and afterwards if any of them were approved, that the aforesaid most blessed Pontiff should consecrate them Presbyters or Deacons. . . . For so was it determined in the same Council, that all things which the same Constantine performed in the Sacraments of the Church and divine worship should be repeated, except sacred Baptism and the holy Chrism.”]

Case of
Ebbo.

The same is the case with regard to Ebbo. The second Council of Soissons annihilates all his Ordinations, and declares them null without hesitation. ^t*Decretum est à sacratissima Synodo, ut quidquid in Ordinationibus Ecclesiasticis idem Ebbo post damnationem suam egerat, secundum traditionem Apostolicæ Sedis, ut in gestis Pontificum legitur, præter sacrum Baptisma, quod in nomine sanctæ Trinitatis perfectum est, irritum et vacuum habeatur.* [It was decreed by the most holy Synod, that whatever in Ecclesiastical Ordinations the same Ebbo had performed after his condemnation, according to the tradition of the Apostolic See, as is read in the acts of the Pontiffs, besides sacred Baptism, which is perfected in the name of the Holy Trinity, should be accounted null and void.]

Case of
Formosus.

As to the case of Formosus, it is so clear, as has already been seen, that there is no answer to give to it besides this sole objection, that all was done contrary to the rules. I allow this: but after all, if re-ordinations had been regarded as a thing as contrary to the nature of Orders, as re-baptization is to the nature of Baptism, it would never have come into the minds of Stephen the Fourth and Sergius the Third, to have all those re-ordained who had been ordained by Formosus, as they did not think of having those re-baptized whom he might have baptized. Even when it is said that all was done contrary to the laws, this is not saying that re-

^t Conc. Sussion. II. A.D. 853. action. 5. [Conc. tom. 8. col. 88, 89.]

ordinations in general were contrary to the laws; but simply that in this case of Formosus, there was no reason to re-ordain those whom he had ordained, and that this was the effect of Stephen's passion against this Pope, which is nothing to the question.

It ought therefore to stand as certain, not only that there has been variation on the subject of re-ordinations, but also that the principles on which we now build more, in order to establish the validity of Ordinations conferred by heretics, have not always been regarded as certain: but, on the contrary, were much contested for a long time.

^u A learned English Divine, Herbert Thorndike by name, in a Book intitled *De Ratione ac Jure Finiendi Controversias Ecclesiæ*, has proposed a principle which he believed might serve to fix the variations here mentioned, and likewise to regulate this point. I shall transcribe the passage, though somewhat long, because it is too important to be abridged, and well deserves to have some reflections made upon it.

^x *In Ordinatione*, says he, *cùm duo esse ex dictis constet, auctoritatem ac jus Ecclesiæ in Ordinante, primum; tum Consecrationis solennitatem, quæ Ministerio Ordinis traditi auctorem Ecclesiam palam inscribit; tanto majoris est momenti Ecclesiæ auctoritas quàm consecrandi ritus, ut in irritum cadat ritè ac more Ecclesiæ peracta Consecratio, ad quam usurpata sit auctoritas Ecclesiæ. Nam etsi in perpetuum Deo sacrum sit, quod semel Deo ritè sacratum fuerit; non tamen Deo ritè sacratum videri debet, quod non sit jure Ecclesiæ Deo consecratum, etsi servato ritu Ecclesiæ. . . .* ^y *Itaque si dubium existat de auctoritate Ecclesiæ, non de ritu ordinandi, non est mirum, accedente auctoritate Ecclesiæ, valere Ordinationem non jure factam, ad id ad quod valere eam vult accedens auctoritas Ecclesiæ. Pauca sunt hujus causæ exempla in rebus veteris Ecclesiæ; pauca quidem, sed sunt tamen quæ eam dubiam esse non sinunt. . . . Sanè cùm nihil majus quæri in hac totâ re possit, quàm ut rata sint apud Deum, quæ fidei plebi ministrantur ab iis quorum dubia sit Ordinatio; nec plebis esse de rebus Ecclesiæ commutibus iudicium dictum sit; statuendum est non posse fidelibus fraudi esse ea apud Deum, in quibus sequuntur fidem Ecclesiæ. . . .* ^z *Igitur*

^u The remaining part of this chapter considerably varies from the French edition, being altered by the learned author. [D. W. See the Editor's notes.] ^{x y z} *De Ratione &c.* cap. 20. p. 363, 365, 367.

CHAP. *non est mirum, accedente Ecclesiæ auctoritate, ratas Ordina-*
 XV. *tiones evadere eas, quæ non accedente Ecclesiæ auctoritate irritæ*
 Thorn- *erant.* [In Ordination, says he, as it is clear from what has
 dike. been said that there are two things; first, the authority and
 right of the Church in the ordainer; next the solemnity of the
 Consecration, which on the ministry of the Order delivered
 inscribes openly the Church as its author; of so much greater
 moment is the authority of the Church than the rite of con-
 secrating, that a Consecration performed rightly and after the
 manner of the Church falls void if the authority of the Church
 have been usurped for it. For although that is for ever sacred
 to God which has once been hallowed to God, yet that
 ought not to be thought duly hallowed to God, which has
 not been consecrated to God by the right of the Church, even
 though the Church's ceremonial has been observed. . . . Hence,
 if there be a doubt about the authority of the Church, not about
 the rite of ordaining, it is not wonderful that if the authority
 of the Church be added, an Ordination not performed with
 right should be valid for that, for which the added authority
 of the Church chooses that it should be valid. There are a
 few examples of this case in the affairs of the ancient Church;
 a few indeed, but they are such as do not leave it doubtful. . . .
 Certainly as nothing greater can be sought in this whole
 matter than that those things should stand good before God
 which are ministered to the faithful people by those whose
 Ordination is doubtful, and it has been said that the judg-
 ment about the common affairs of the Church does not
 belong to the people; we must determine that those things
 cannot injure the faithful with God, in which they follow the
 faith of the Church. . . . Therefore it is not wonderful, that
 if the authority of the Church be added, those Ordinations
 become valid, which without the added authority of the
 Church were void.]

Obser-
 vations,
 First.

1. The author supposes with St. Leo^a, that two things are
 necessary for the validity of Ordination; the solemnity of the
 Rite prescribed either by our Saviour, or in default of such
 appointment, by the Church; and the authority of the
 Church; *auctoritatem ac jus Ecclesiæ*—; *tum Consecrationis*
solennitatem: [the authority and right of the Church—; next

^a Leo Magnus, Ep. 2. inquis. 1. [p. 404, 405. Ed. Quesnel, Paris. 1675.]

the solemnity of Consecration.] And this point ought not to appear extraordinary, since in fact it is not thought that a Sacrament conferred in heresy is valid for any other reason, than because it is supposed that what is done in heresy is a consequence of the power of the Church, which error cannot suspend. But if the profession of error cannot suspend the power of the Church, cannot the Church herself arrest her own power, and refuse to acknowledge as her work what has been performed out of her bosom? The author maintains it, and I know not at what point it could be disputed.

2. If, according to Thorndike, these two things are equally Second. necessary, as it is certain that the omission of the Rite destroys the Sacrament, the want of the authority of the Church ought, by a necessary consequence, to produce the same effect. And this may easily be comprehended, by comparing the case of Marriage, in which the matter and form are in vain made use of if the laws of the Church and State are violated, since in default of authority Marriage is null by the consent of all our Divines: *Non Deo ritè sacratum videri debet, quod non sit jure Ecclesiæ Deo consecratum, etsi servato ritu Ecclesiæ.* [That ought not to be thought duly hallowed to God, which has not been consecrated to God by the right of the Church, even though the Church's ceremonial has been observed.]

3. He says that it is [thus] easy to be conceived how an Or- Third. dination that was invalid, may afterwards become valid, without any thing new intervening [therein]. For the essential Rite having been administered, the Church, which at first by refusing her consent hindered this Sacrament from having its effect, afterwards taking away this impediment by the consent she restores, causes nothing more to be wanting to render the Sacrament valid. *Itaque si dubium existat de auctoritate Ecclesiæ, non de ritu Ordinandi, non est mirum, accedente auctoritate Ecclesiæ, valere Ordinationem non jure factam, ad id ad quod valere eam vult accedens auctoritas Ecclesiæ.* [Hence, if there be a doubt about the authority of the Church, not about the rite of ordaining, it is not wonderful that if the authority of the Church be added, an Ordination not performed with right should be valid for that, for which the added authority of the Church chooses that it should be valid.]

CHAP.
XV.

Fourth.

4. ^bThis maxim, according to this author, should be very proper to reconcile all the opposite facts before related. For, says he, admitting as a principle, that the authority of the Church is as essential to the validity of the Sacrament as the use of the matter and form, it ought not to appear surprising, that some Ordinations have not been judged valid, and that others have been received; the Church having been pleased, as a matter of condescension, to recognise the one, and as a matter of severity, or for reasons of prudence, not to admit the rest. *Non est mirum, accedente Ecclesiæ auctoritate, ratas Ordinationes evadere eas, quæ non accedente auctoritate Ecclesiæ irritæ erant.* [It is not wonderful, that if the authority of the Church be added, those Ordinations become valid, which without the added authority of the Church were void.] On the contrary, if this principle be not admitted, the reconciling of these facts is impossible. ^c*Conciliandorum sibi invicem Ecclesiæ decretorum et gestorum rationem inibimus frustra, hac repudiata, quærendam.* [In vain shall we endeavour to find a plan, if we reject this, of reconciling together the decrees and doings of the Church.]

Fifth.

5. It is true it does not appear that in the case of the Baptism of the heretics they reasoned on this principle; but then, as has been shewn before, the ancients did not always argue in the same way as to these two Sacraments. “^dI know,” says he, “that it has been otherwise determined as to the Baptism of heretics, But this must not be extended to Ordination; It is not necessary to allow the Confirmation of heretics valid, whose Baptism is such; much less their Ordination.” And it appears in fact that St. Leo, in his Letter to Rusticus of Narbonne, left the validity of Ordination to the good pleasure and authority of the Church. ^e*Si qui autem Clerici, says this great Pope, ab istis pseudo-episcopis in eis Ecclesiis ordinati sunt, qui^f ad proprios Episcopos pertinebant, et Ordinatio eorum consensu et judicio præsentium*

[^b So Mr. Williams gives this sentence. See note u, p. 275. and the Editor's notes.]

[^c Thorndike, *ibid.* p. 370.]

^d Scio aliter decretum esse de Baptismo hæreticorum, . . . Sed hoc ad Ordinationem trahendum non est; . . . Non est necesse ratam hæreticorum Confir-

mationem concedere, quorum ratus sit Baptismus; multo minus Ordinationem. *Thorndike, ubi supra.* [p. 363.]

^e Leo Mag. Ep. 2. inquis. 1. [p. 404, 405. Ed. Quesnel. Paris. 1675.]

[^f See Quesnel's note, Appendix to St. Leo's Works, p. 787.]

fucta est, potest rata haberi, ita ut in ipsis Ecclesiis perseverent. Aliter autem vana habenda est creatio, quæ nec loco fundata est, nec auctore munita. [But if in those Churches there have been ordained by those pretended Bishops any Clergymen who belonged to their proper Bishops, and their Ordination has taken place with the consent and approbation of the presidents, it may be held valid, so that they remain in the same Churches. But otherwise that creation is to be accounted void, which is neither founded in place, nor supported by an authority.]

6. This author even maintains that this principle alone is ^{Sixth.} sufficient to remove all ambiguity from equivocal Ordinations; and that the people in following it, are under no necessity to enter into a troublesome enquiry about the validity or invalidity of Ordinations, since they cannot err in yielding themselves to the judgment of the Church upon this matter, and since her declaration will determine all their doubts. *Statuendum est non posse fidelibus fraudi esse ea apud Deum, in quibus sequuntur fidem Ecclesiæ.* [We must determine that those things cannot injure the faithful with God, in which they follow the faith of the Church.]

This is precisely the author's system, the solidity of which ^{Summing up.} I leave to the reader's judgment. What is most certain is, that if it appears not altogether unreasonable, and if it has some advantages, it has yet more inconveniences, and is absolutely destroyed by fact and by the practice of the Church; and has never been made use of to explain the difficulty in question. For if those who have disputed the validity of some Sacraments seem to suppose it, the arguments of those who have opposed re-ordinations, and who have at last prevailed in the Church, have always supposed the contrary. So that the result of the whole is, that there has been little uniformity in the Church as to this matter; and that, if the principle now received in the Catholic Schools is adopted, we cannot dispute with the English the validity of their Ordination.

CHAP. XVI.

THE SUCCESSION OF THE ENGLISH BISHOPS HAS NOT BEEN INTERRUPTED BY THE SCHISM.

CHAP. XVI.

The author does not undertake to prove the Anglican Bishops legitimate.

What is wanting to make them lawful Bishops.

General argument.

Grounds of early objectors.

THIS proposition is the consequence of all the rest, and the natural conclusion of this Treatise. It is not necessary, before establishing its truth, to repeat what I have already frequently observed, that I do not undertake to prove that these Bishops are lawfully Bishops, that they still preserve their jurisdiction, and that they perform legitimately the functions annexed to their dignity and character. I have explained myself in terms so clear and so distinct on this head, that no one can impute to me without injustice an opinion which I disavow, and which does not necessarily follow from any of the principles I have laid down. This proposition therefore is restricted to proving that the Bishops who since the Schism, down to our times, have successively filled the English Sees, have been true Bishops, and that nothing is wanting to make them lawful Bishops, but to be united to the Catholic Church.

This thesis, confined to these terms, is a necessary consequence of the principles and facts which have been laid down in this Dissertation. For if, on the one side, there is nothing wanting to the matter and form which have been used in the Ordination of the English Bishops; and if, on the other, those who have administered this Sacrament were themselves validly consecrated, it follows necessarily, that notwithstanding the disturbances which have agitated that Church, and the novelties which have been introduced into the Rite of Ordination, the English Bishops are true Bishops, and that there is nothing wanting to them in respect of their character. This consequence is so certain, that it is not disputed by any of those who allow as valid the Ordinations performed according to Edward the Sixth's Ritual. And if Sanders, Harding, Stapleton, and other Divines would never allow as Bishops those who were such in the reign of Elizabeth, it was because

their Ordination appeared to them null, and the succession consequently interrupted.

Such in fact was the position maintained by the greater part of the Catholic Divines of the time of Elizabeth. But on what was it founded? This they do not explain to us; unless, at least, we accept declamations for reasons, and invectives and passionate prejudices take the place of solid proofs and convincing demonstrations. And to convince one's self of this, one need only reflect that the fable of the Nag's-head was not as yet born, and that the validity of the Ordinations of these Bishops was contested only on the opinion, now abandoned, of the necessity of the delivery of the instruments as matter, and of the prayers which accompany them as form; and because of the omission of all the ceremonies prescribed by the Roman Pontifical. But a position which has no other foundations, is evidently weak and incapable of being maintained, since it is now unanimously agreed, that all this is but accidental to Ordination, and that imposition of hands is the only thing which ought always to have been regarded as essential.

This opinion therefore of the English Divines does not at all disturb the validity of the English Ordinations, and consequently, does not prejudice the succession of the Bishops of that Church. But to shew this more at large, we may observe four different epochs at which the succession may have been interrupted; namely, under Henry the Eighth, under Edward the Sixth, under Elizabeth, and under Cromwell. There is however no one of these to which we can fix the interruption of the succession of the Bishops; and the proof of this is easy, after the facts we have given before.

In fact, to begin with the reign of Henry the Eighth, there is no one who ventures to maintain, that in that reign the succession was interrupted; since by the consent even of the Divines most opposed to that Church, the whole Rite of Ordination was preserved, the unctions and the other ceremonies were retained, and all was then performed with so much exactness, that in the reign of Mary, in order to re-establish things in their former state, they did but restore what had been done up to the end of the reign of Henry the Eighth. *Ceremoniam et solennem unctionem, more Ecclesiastico, adhuc in Conse-*

Four epochs of danger.

I. Henry VIII. No difficulty in his reign.

C H A P.
XVI.(First
epoch.)

eratione illâ adhiberi voluit (Henricus Octavus), [The ceremonial and solemn unction, according to Ecclesiastical usage, he (Henry the Eighth) chose still to have used in that Consecration,] says Sanders^a, who, noticing the change made under Edward, again repeats, that under Henry all the Priests and Bishops had been ordained in a Catholic manner. ^b*Primo loco sancierunt, ut cùm Episcopi ac Presbyteri Anglicani, Ritu ferè Catholico (exceptâ Romani Pontificis obedientiâ, quam omnes abnegabant) ad illud usque tempus ordinati fuissent, in postremum aliâ omninò formâ ab ipsis præscriptâ Ordinationes fierent.* [They determined in the first place that whereas the English Bishops and Priests had up to that time been ordained almost according to the Catholic Rite, (the obedience to the Roman Pontiff, which all abjured, excepted), for the future the Ordinations should be performed according to a Form altogether different, prescribed by themselves.] Accordingly the Parliament held in the first year of Mary, directed that they should resume “^call such Divine Service and Administration of Sacraments as were most commonly used in England in the last year of King Henry the Eighth”. It ought therefore to pass for certain that all the Bishops, and consequently the Episcopacy, subsisted entire and without interruption in the reign of Henry the Eighth, notwithstanding the Schism which arose under that Prince, and which was but strengthened afterwards. For there were a great number of Bishops consecrated in this reign after the Schism. Cranmer’s Register has preserved several for us; and among others, Rowland Lee Bishop of Coventry, George Brown Archbishop of Dublin, Robert Warton Bishop of St. Asaph, Robert Holgate Bishop of Landaff, Thomas Thirlby Bishop of Westminster, John Wakeman Bishop of Gloucester, John Skip Bishop of Hereford, Arthur Bulkeley Bishop of Bangor, Paul Bush Bishop of Bristol, Anthony Kitchin Bishop of Landaff, &c. All these Bishops were consecrated after the Schism, and ordained according to the entire Rite of the Roman Pontifical, excepting the oath taken to the Pope. The Romans themselves acknowledged these Bishops as validly ordained, since

Bishops
consecrated
after the
Schism.^a De Schismate Anglicano, lib. 3. p. 348.^b Ibid. lib. 2. p. 243, 244.^c 1 Mary, Sess. 2. c. 2. (Statutes at Large, vol. 1. p. 709.)

at the time of the re-union under Queen Mary, several were continued in their Sees without its being thought necessary to reiterate their Ordination, as Robert Warton, George Day, Anthony Kitchin, Thirlby Bishop of Westminster, &c. They were therefore convinced that up to that time the succession of the Bishops had not been interrupted in England, and that notwithstanding the Schism, the Episcopate had not been destroyed.

The second epoch causes a little more difficulty. It is that of Edward the Sixth. It was under that Prince that the Form of Ordination was changed; and Cranmer, who had a great hand in this change, was the first who authorized it by his example^d, in the Ordination he performed on John Poynt as Bishop of Rochester, the twenty-ninth of June 1550. They afterwards followed no other Formula during that reign; and the Parliament made a Statute to abolish the Book of Ordinations which was used before the reign of Edward. They still continued however to ordain Bishops; they preserved the imposition of hands and prayer; they retained even, according to Sanders, the ancient number of Bishops prescribed by the Canons for consecrating new ones. ^e *Servata semper priori, de numero presentium Episcoporum qui manus ordinando imponerent, lege.* [Preserving always the former law concerning the number of Bishops present to lay hands on the person to be ordained.] The difficulty then which may be made as to this epoch can arise only from the change made in the Rite of Ordination: but this difficulty is weak, and scarcely deserves to occupy our time, after all that has been proved in the course of this Dissertation.

I shall content myself with making two remarks, which will suffice to put the matter out of dispute. First, that the Ordination of the new Bishops is sufficient of itself to assure the succession. The second, which ought to be still more decisive, according to the principles of those with whom I have to contend, is that even under Edward, the ancient Episcopate subsisted, and always prevailed during that reign. I begin the proof with this last.

England has in all twenty-six Episcopal Sees; and during

^d Memorials of Thomas Cranmer, p. 192.

^e De Schism. Angl. lib. 3. p. 348.

(First epoch.)

II. Edward VI.

Two remarks.

Only six Bishops

CHAP.
XVI.
consecrated by the
new Form.
(Second
epoch.)

the whole reign of Edward the Sixth, there were but six Bishops ordained according to the new Rite, to fill any of these Sees which were vacant either by death or by deposition. In fact, the new Rite did not last three whole years, since Poynt, who was the first ordained according to the new Form^f, received Ordination June 29, 1550^g, and Harley, who was the last, was ordained May 26, 1553^h. During the interval of these three years, we find only four Bishops ordained for England according to the new Rite, namely, Hooper for Gloucester March 8, 1554ⁱ, Scory for Rochester, and Coverdale for Exeter, who received Consecration August 30, 1551^k; and Taylor for Lincoln, who was ordained June 26, 1552^l. So that as of the twenty-six Bishops necessary to fill up the vacant Sees of that Church, during the whole reign of Edward there were but six ordained according to the new Rite, viz. Poynt, Hooper, Scory, Coverdale, Taylor, and Harley, and as all the rest preserved still the ancient Ordination, is it not demonstrated that the succession subsisted during this reign, and that the new Rite lasted too short a time to interrupt it, and to change the nature of the Episcopate?

The new
Form
valid.

This remark alone appears sufficient to assure the succession of the Episcopate in that reign: but I add, that the Ordination itself of the new Bishops would suffice to oblige us to own that the Episcopate subsisted under Edward, in spite of the change introduced into the Formulary of the Ordinations. For to confine myself here to an argument of which the practice of the Church and the consent of Divines makes the whole force, The Catholic Church receives as valid all those Ordinations performed in schism and heresy in which nothing essential is omitted. Cardinal Pole himself acknowledged this in the power he gave to the Chapter of Canterbury January 8, 1555, to reconcile those who should be willing to re-unite themselves to the Church. ^m *Quodque, irregularitate et aliis præmissis non obstantibus, in suis Ordinibus etiam ab hæreticis et schismaticis Episcopis, etiam minus ritè, dummodo in eorum collatione Ecclesiastica forma et intentio sit servata, per eos susceptis, . . . etiam in Altaris Ministerio ministrare, . . . valeant.*

Cardinal
Pole ad-
mitted it.

^f Memorials of Cranmer, p. 192.
^{g h} Ibid. p. 253. and 301.

^{i k l} Ibid. p. 254, 271, and 293.
^m Ibid. Appendix, p. 188.

[And that, irregularity and the other premisses notwithstanding, in their Orders, even from heretical and schismatical Bishops, even irregularly (provided only that in conferring them the form and intention of the Church were preserved) received by their hands, . . . they may minister even in the Ministry of the Altar.] But according to another principle now almost universally received in the Schools, and generally by all learned Divines, imposition of hands and prayer are the only essentials of Ordination, and the Ritual of Edward has preserved both: Therefore the Bishops ordained by this new Ritual are truly Bishops, and this new Ordination would suffice alone to assure the succession of the Episcopate.

(Second epoch.)

I do not see what can be opposed to this proof; the more because these new Bishops were consecrated by others of whose Consecration there was never any doubt; because some of those who had been employed in similar Consecrations, as Robert of Carlisle, who had assisted in that of Harleyⁿ, were continued^o in Mary's reign; and because in the sentences of deposition which that Princess caused to be pronounced against these Bishops, they did not at all assign as a reason against them the defect of the Rite in their Consecration, but the defect of the title enounced in their Letters patent, and the crimes with which they were charged in particular; which proves evidently, that they did not doubt the validity of the new Form, and that consequently these new Bishops were qualified to preserve the succession, even though the ancient Episcopate had not existed: but it did exist still, and the second epoch is in every sense clear of damage.

Facts proving it to have been admitted.

The third epoch, which is that of the reign of Elizabeth, is the most noted of all; and it is on this that they insist with the greatest earnestness, although it has scarcely a more solid foundation than that on which they rest to make out an interruption of the succession in the time of Edward. It is true that in this reign the Bishops consecrated by the ancient Formulary were altogether wanting. For the Queen, in the first year of her reign, filled up almost all the Sees of England, vacant either by the death or by the deposition of the former

III. Elizabeth.

Old Bishops entirely wanting.

ⁿ Memorials of Crammer, p. 301.

^p Ant. Harmer, p. 133.

^o Fasti Eccl. Angl. p. 335.

CHAP. XVI. Bishops; and excepting Barlow, Kitchin, and some others, who died a few years afterwards, this Church found herself all at once made new, so that there did not remain so much as one Bishop consecrated according to the form prescribed by the old Pontifical.

(Third epoch.)

Other difficulties.

This is the first difference found between the time of Edward and that of Elizabeth; but it is maintained that this is not the only one. The principal one according to some, is drawn from the uncertainty of the Consecration of the new Bishops. It is not that they did not receive a kind of Ordination; but it is maintained that it is very uncertain whether the person from whom they derive it was himself truly ordained; and that the uncertainty of this Ordination, joined to the novelty of the Rite by which they were consecrated, essentially damages the succession, and will not allow us by any means to believe that the Episcopal Ministry remained without interruption in the Church of England. This uncertainty is not found equally in the time of Edward, since there remained more than twenty Bishops certainly ordained, and even according to the Roman Pontifical. No inference, therefore, according to these Divines, can be drawn from the times of Edward to those of Elizabeth; and even though it should have been demonstrated that the succession was not interrupted in the days of the former, it must be proved altogether anew, that it did not any more fail in the time of Elizabeth; which is nothing near so easy, if regard be had to the alteration of circumstances.

Conditional admission.

If the uncertainty of Parker's Consecration were clear, it would be absolutely necessary to abandon the defence of the succession. In things of this nature, it is necessary that the facts should be certain, in order that one may be able to draw from them a sufficient consequence.

Differences among objectors.

But on this there is an important observation to make. It is, that among those who dispute the succession and the validity of the Ordinations, there is a great opposition of opinions and principles. Some agree that the new Formulary of Edward contains all that is essential to render Ordinations valid; but they deny that it was used in Parker's Ordination, or that the Consecrator who used it was a true Bishop; and this opinion is the most common among those who, not-

withstanding their ignorance of the facts, are better instructed on the subject of Divinity. Others allow that Parker received an Ordination; but they dispute the validity of the Rite, and this was the opinion of the Divines who were contemporary with Parker. Others agree with the former ones, that the Rite was valid, and with the second that Parker was ordained by it; but they maintain that the Consecrator was never consecrated, or at least, that there is no proof that he was; and this is the refuge of those who confine themselves exclusively to the doubt. Others, lastly, deny the whole, both the validity of the Rite, and the Ordination of Parker according to that Rite, and maintain that he had no other than a mock Ordination, performed in a Tavern, and more proper to serve for the denouement of a comedy, than to establish the succession of a Church. Such is the opinion of Champney, who first brought it into vogue, and who has since had so many defenders. All these opinions are refuted by one another, and it would be almost sufficient to establish the contested succession, to destroy the arguments of one party by those of another, and to judge of their want of solidity by their contrariety.

Without however insisting too much on this contrariety, we have but to call to mind what has been proved in the course of this Dissertation, to shew the weakness of all these different sides.

1. The ridiculousness of the charge, that the Ordination was performed in a Tavern, has been demonstrated in the second chapter; and it has been proved evidently that this fable, invented as an afterthought, is inconsistent not merely with the Record of the Ordination which still remains, and which they in vain endeavour to prove supposititious, but also with all the other public documents, whether of the Tower or of the Ecclesiastical Archives, which concern the Ordination of Parker, and that of all the other Bishops, which must also of necessity be supposed forged: a supposition which no one hitherto has even attempted to prove. Even independently of this inconsistency, which of itself forms a demonstration, they have not so much as observed probabilities; and all the circumstances are so ludicrous and so contrary to good sense and likelihood, that the mere statement

(Third epoch.)

Recapitulation.

1. Nag's-head story.

CHAP.
XVI.

(Third
epoch.)
2. Barlow
truly con-
secrated.

Anglicans
in the case
of the Do-
natists &c.

3. The new
Form
valid.
What must
be proved
to make it
invalid.

of a chimera of this kind is its most convincing refutation, and the only one it properly deserves.

2. What has been produced in the third, fourth, and fifth chapters, proves not merely the truth, but even the notoriety, of Barlow's Consecration; in such sort that the proofs do to that degree establish the truth of the fact, that they leave no room even for a doubt, as has been shewn in the twelfth chapter. But as the doubt is now become the last, and in a manner the only refuge of those who dispute the validity of the English Ordinations, this uncertainty being taken away, and the notoriety of Barlow's Consecration being fully established, there remains nothing more for those who in other respects acknowledge the truth of Parker's Consecration, and the sufficiency of the new Rite, than to confess that there is no longer any ground to deny the succession of the Episcopate, and that the English are in the case of the Donatists and other Sects, whose separation caused them to lose neither their Ordination nor their character, and who by returning to the unity of the Church recover all the rights and all the advantages they had lost by their schism, or from which they had fallen by their declared adherence to their errors.

3. As for those who dispute the validity of the new Rite, in order to defend an opinion which has no other foundation than the prejudice of a Scholastic theology, they must make it appear either that imposition of hands and prayer do not make up the only essentials of Ordination, or that all the ceremonies fixed by the long usage of a Church are incapable of being changed without destroying the Sacrament of which they make a part, although these ceremonies have been practised neither every where nor at all times; or that these ceremonies may become essential otherwise than by the determination of holy Scripture, or a tradition equivalent to such determination, or at least by the consent and practice of all the Churches in the world; or, lastly, that every alteration made by heretics or schismatics in the administration of the Sacraments, or rather in the non-essential ceremonies which accompany them, renders those Sacraments null and invalid. If all these positions are equally indefensible, it can not any more be maintained that the new Rite introduced by Edward

the Sixth could render null the Ordinations of the new Bishops, and consequently interrupt the succession.

But it has been proved that all these propositions are contrary to truth, and to all the theological opinions which have been held up to this time, as to what constitutes the nature and the validity of the Sacraments; and I dare even affirm with some confidence, that one may well defy those who attack the validity of the new Rite to prove that any of these propositions, not merely are true, but even have any reasonable degree of probability. This is not the place to destroy and refute them in detail, or even to repeat what may relate to them. It is enough to observe, that on the strength of the proofs which have been produced, we have a right to conclude that the new Rite is sufficient, and that it follows thence that the succession is certain, the one being an evident consequence of the other. For if it be agreed as to Parker's Ordination, this Ordination being once proved good, the chain of the succession is clear, since the new Bishops derive their Ordination from Parker, and Parker derives his from the old ones.

4. As for those who, allowing the validity of the new Rite, venture to maintain either that Parker was not ordained according to that Rite, or that he was ordained by a man not consecrated, they have been refuted beforehand in what has just been said; since, this hypothesis being founded only on the Fable of the Tavern, or on the non-consecration of Barlow, the overturning of these two falsehoods entirely destroys the chimerical pretence of these authors, and assures to the Ordination of the English, and to their succession, a soundness which we cannot in justice contest with them.

This third period then has nothing contrary to the succession of the Bishops. The two differences which distinguish it from that of Edward, are either not real, or not solid. The uncertainty of Parker's Ordination is a chimera, and the preservation of the old Bishops becomes unnecessary, after we are assured that the Ordination of the new ones is valid, and consequently sufficient. Let the Episcopate subsist in Ministers ordained according to the Roman Pontifical, or in others ordained according to a Rite in which what is essential has been equally preserved, it is still the same Episcopate.

All these propositions false.

Result.

4. Parker ordained according to the new Rite, and by a consecrated Bishop.

Summing up.

CHAP.
XVI.

The succession of the doctrine, if you please, is no longer preserved; the unity is altered, or rather broken, by the schism; but the Ministry is continued; and according to St. Augustine, it is still the Church that brings forth, whether it be by means of Sarah, or by means of Agar; because even out of the Church the character which our Saviour has imprinted cannot be lost, but is preserved amongst the additions or retrenchments which are the ordinary result of separation from the Church.

IV. Cromwell. No difficulty.

This epoch once cleared from danger, there remains no further difficulty for the remaining period; and the interruption which happened under Cromwell was too short to produce any change in the government of that Church. From Elizabeth to Charles the First, the succession continued from one to another by the Ordinations which were made of new Bishops, as they happened to be wanted. The Rite prescribed by Edward, and resumed by Elizabeth, was exactly observed. The government of that Church was always Episcopal, until Cromwell, having perceived that the Bishops were too much attached to the King, and that the Presbyterians were more favourable to the Republican Government he wished to establish, suspended the election of new Bishops, and would have entirely destroyed Episcopacy in that Kingdom, if he had lived long enough to see all the Bishops ordained previously to his elevation die before him.

End of his projects.

But his tyranny had its times determined in the order of Providence. “Cromwell was about to destroy all”, wisely observes Pascal, “but for a little grain of sand which fixed itself in his ureter. But this little gravel-stone, which elsewhere was nothing, fixed in that place, we see him dead, his family abased, and the King restored”: let us add, and the Episcopate afterwards, since under Charles the Second the Bishops who survived Cromwell immediately ordained others, who repaired the succession which that rebel had wished to annihilate.

Nine of the old

In fact, in 1660^r there still remained at least nine Bishops

^q Cromwel alloit tout ravager sans un petit grain de sable qui se mit dans son uretère. Mais ce petit gravier, qui n'étoit rien ailleurs, mis en cet endroit,

le voilà mort, sa famille abaissée, et le Roi rétabli.—*Pens. art. 24.* p. 127.

^r Collier's *Eccl. Hist.*, vol. 2. p. 873.

ordained before the great Rebellion; that is to say, the Bishops of London, Bath, Oxford, Rochester, Bangor, Ely, Salisbury, Chichester, and Coventry. In this year almost all the other Sees were filled, ^{and several of the new Bishops,} as those of London, Durham, St. David's, Peterborough, Landaff, Carlisle, Chester, Exeter, Salisbury, Worcester, Lincoln, and St. Asaph, were consecrated by some of those who remained, and according to the Rite authorized in England from the time of Elizabeth. Thus if the succession subsisted under Elizabeth, it could not have been interrupted in the time of Charles the Second; and it is evident that if the Bishops fell, Episcopacy did not fall with them; and that to make it legitimate, there needs only to renounce their schism and error.

Bishops
alive in
1660.

All these facts are clear, and I see only one reasonable difficulty that can be objected to them. It is, that to continue the Episcopal succession, there must be not merely a valid Ordination, but also a lawful right in the Bishops who occupy the Episcopal Sees, without which they are intruders and usurpers. But, say they, the new English Bishops have no such right, 1. Because the greater part were ordained during the life of the true Bishops, without their consent. 2. Because they occupied their Sees in virtue of a vicious title, that is to say, in virtue of provisions granted by a lay and excommunicated Prince. 3. Because they are themselves notoriously excommunicated and irregular. This succession therefore cannot be maintained; and even supposing the validity of the Ordination, there remains to the English no means of making it effectual and reinstating it^t.

General
objection.
Want of
lawful
right.

This, as I said in speaking of the authority of national Churches, is a mere question about a name. I am willing to suppose, with the authors of the objection, that the succession is not regularly founded; that it was formed contrary to the laws; that the new Bishops intruded into the place of the old ones, without a legitimate authority: this is not exactly the question. When we speak in this matter of succession, our proper business is only to ascertain whether there be among

This a
question
about a
name.
Admis-
sion.

What the
real ques-
tion is.

^s Ibid. [See the Editor's notes.] some measure in the Translator's Preface. [D. W.]

^t See these objections answered in

CHAP.
XVI.

the English a succession of Bishops validly ordained, who have transmitted Ordination from hand to hand, and with whom we cannot dispute the lawful exercise of their Ministry as soon as the Church, by receiving them into her bosom, shall have corrected what is faulty in their vocation. Be they then intruders into their Sees, be their title faulty, be they excommunicated and irregular themselves; all this makes their calling and the exercise of their functions very unlawful, but it does not interrupt the succession of valid Ordinations, which preserves the soundness of the Priesthood and of the Episcopate, in spite of the faults and defects which schism or heresy may have mingled therewith.

Other se-
parated
bodies.

Case of
the Dona-
tists com-
pared.

Such is the succession which has been preserved in all the Sects which have separated themselves from the Church. When the Donatists made a schism, the succession of the Episcopate was acknowledged in them. Yet they were guilty of the same intrusion with which the English are reproached. They had erected Altar against Altar; they had put themselves in the place of the Catholic Bishops; their title was altogether faulty, and they were equally excommunicated and irregular. Nevertheless the Catholic Bishops acknowledged in them the validity of the Priesthood, and far from disputing their succession, offered to yield them their place, provided they would by their re-union terminate the schism. We cannot refuse the English a succession of the same nature, supposing once the validity of their Ordination, which the authors of the objection are willing to admit. Their cause is not different, and is even more favourable, since in acknowledging them it is not necessary to displace any one. The variety so little essential, which is found in the Rite they have substituted for the old one, cannot be used as an argument; and the reiteration of the Sacraments is so contrary to the spirit of the Catholic Church, that I do not hesitate to believe, that they would never have adopted it at Rome in the case of the English, if their prepossession had been corrected, with respect to the fable of the Nag's-head, which has always been believed true there, as the celebrated M. Fontanini acknowledges, in a letter written not long since to one of my friends.

Cause of
the prac-
tice adop-
ted at
Rome.

CHAP. XVII.

CONCLUSION AND RECAPITULATION OF THIS TREATISE.

I DO not think I have omitted any thing that might be of use towards clearing up the subject I proposed to examine. I have even given the difficulties more force than they commonly have, because having proposed to myself no other end but that of knowing the truth, I had no other interest but to clear it up, and was as ready to yield to the force of the objections as to that of the answers. It is for the public now to determine on which side the truth is found, and to decide whether there be the least reason for reiterating Ordinations whose validity, it should seem, ought to appear clear of damage.

General
observa-
tion.

For to recapitulate in a few words all we have set forth in this Work, re-ordinations have always been odious in the Church; and it is necessary, in order to come to this, either that the nullity be evident, or that the doubt be solid, and founded on weighty reasons, or on facts of which the discussion is impracticable. But there is neither an evident nullity, nor a sufficiently solid doubt to oblige us to reiterate the Ordination of the English.

Reordina-
tions al-
ways o-
dious.

Parker is the source and stem of this new Ministry. It is on his Ordination that all the others depend, and the validity of this carries with it that of all the Bishops ordained since the Schism, and consequently the clear succession of the Episcopate in England. The validity of his Ordination depends principally on two things: the person of the Consecrator, and the form of the Consecration.

Parker the
stem of the
new Mi-
nistry.

As to the first of the Consecrators, who is Barlow, (for as to the other three who were his fellow-ministers of this Ordination there is no dispute,) we have proved in the third, fourth, and fifth chapters, that he was consecrated himself in the time of Henry the Eighth, and consequently according to the Roman Pontifical; that, although the Record of his Consecration has not yet been found, yet we cannot

His Con-
secrator
(Barlow)
was con-
secrated
himself.

CHAP.
XVII.

doubt that he was truly consecrated, because this omission is supplied by positive testimonies, by a number of Records which all suppose his Consecration, by a general admission on the part of his contemporaries, whether friends or enemies, who regarded him as a Bishop, or who never reproached him with not being such; by the notoriety of the fact, which cannot be concealed, considering the number of persons interested therein; in a word, by the example of similar omissions, which were never insisted upon, and by the little solidity found in the difficulties which are opposed to the reality of this Consecration.

The contrary never maintained during his life.

It is not then from the side of the Consecrator that persons can deduce the nullity of the Consecration of Parker, to whom in fact it was never made a reproach during his life, that he had been consecrated by a man who had not been consecrated himself.

The new Ritual does not differ in essentials from the Roman Pontifical.

No more can it be from the side of the form ordained by the Ritual of Edward; since, as has been seen in the sixth and seventh chapters, this form does not differ as to essentials from that of the Roman Pontifical. For according to all our best Divines, what is essential to the form of Ordination is the invocation of the Holy Spirit, or the prayer by which are desired for the Bishop elect the lights and graces which are necessary to him in order to acquit himself worthily of his Ministry. But this invocation and this prayer is found, though in different terms, in Edward's Ritual, as well as in the Roman Pontifical; and by comparing one with the other, it is easy to convince one's self of it.

The Nag's-head story utterly indefensible.

We have shewn elsewhere, in the second chapter, that in the Ordination of Parker the Form in question was used; that the ceremony of his Consecration performed in a Tavern, is a tissue of falsehoods of which it is hard to say which is most inconsistent with the rest; that the relation containing it agrees neither with itself, nor with the public Registers; that there was no necessity nor any advantage in having recourse to such an Ordination; that they were in want neither of Bishops nor of a place to perform this ceremony; that although several Prelates had refused to be concerned in the affair, there remained more than enough to perform this function; that this fable was unknown to the contemporary writers who

were the greatest enemies to the new Ordinations, and the most disposed to decry them; that the menace of excommunication, invented to serve as a pretext for this fable, has not even the probability necessary to colour a falsehood; in a word, that however little we examine into this relation, with all its circumstances and the testimonies on which it rests, we shall only confirm ourselves in the opinion, that it is but a story forged as an after-thought, in order to make these Ordinations odious, which until then they attacked without success.

It has therefore been evidently demonstrated, that there is not in the Ordination, considered in itself, any nullity which can render it invalid.

The Ordination therefore not invalid in itself.

In order to endeavour to find out some other nullity, the adversaries have had recourse to exterior proofs. They have maintained that the alteration of the form was made without any legitimate authority; that it was to the secular power that all the correction was owing, which was pretended to be made in the Roman Pontifical; that even though one were obliged to admit that this decision was made by the Ecclesiastical authority, a particular Church like that of England, has no right to change by her own authority the forms of the Sacraments; and that thus, on which side soever you take a view of this alteration, you cannot avoid meeting with nullities which render the Ordinations invalid, or which at least make them so suspicious, that the doubt thence arising is sufficient of itself to oblige us to reiterate these Ordinations, as if they were evidently null.

Other alleged nullities.

But all these alleged nullities have not been difficult to destroy. It has been seen in the eleventh chapter that it was by the Ecclesiastical authority that the change was made in the Form of Ordination, and that the spiritual authority, which the laws give the Kings of England, regards only the exterior power. “We must know that in Bishops,” says Archbishop Bramhall^a, “there is a threefold power; the first of order, the second of interior jurisdiction, the third of exterior jurisdiction. The first is referred to the consecrating and administering of the Sacraments; the second to the regiment of

Refuted. Spiritual authority in England.

Bramhall.

^a Bramhall's Works, p. 337, 338.

CHAP.
XVII.

The Or-
dination
Service
reformed
by Eccle-
siastics.

Powers of
a national
Church.

Schism
does not
alter the
case.

Christians in the interior court of conscience; the third to the regiment of Christian people in the exterior court of the Church. Concerning the two former," says he, ^b 'there is no controversy between the Church of Rome and us. Our only dispute is about the third; and it is of this last power that we place the origin in Princes; and it is in this sense that they are heads of the Church.' We know further that the reformation of the Book of Ordinations was made by Bishops and Divines nominated for that purpose, and that neither the King nor the Parliament did any thing else in this matter, but grant the Bishops the protection and authority of which they have need, in order to have their regulations executed, and to maintain their observance.

It has been proved in the tenth chapter, that a national Church may, without exceeding her powers, regulate herself the forms of the Sacraments which have not been determined by our Saviour, and on which there is no decision of a general Council, nor any clear and uniform tradition in the Churches: that the evident possession as well of the Eastern as of the Western Churches, is an undisputable proof of it: that this possession is founded on unanswerable reasons, that is to say, on the right which each Church has of forming her own discipline; on the independence of Churches with respect to one another in this point; on the variations which the most considerable Churches have made themselves in their own form, so little did they think them unalterable; in a word, on all the reasons which prove that each Church is free as to what does not affect the substance of the Sacrament, because the rest belongs properly to nothing but what is called its integrity.

If there was some difficulty about this, that this power ought not to be allowed except to those Churches which have not separated themselves from the Catholic Church, it has been shewn in the same chapter, that this distinction was unknown in the ancient Church, who did not regard as null either the Ordinations or the Sacrifice, or the other Sacraments administered by the Nestorians, the Eutychians, and the other heretics; that the alterations have seldom been made but in schism and heresy; that the greater part of the forms themselves or of the Liturgies were not written

[^b Ibid. p. 338—341. See the Editor's notes.]

until after the birth of the heresy ; that when the re-union of these different Sects was treated of, there was no mention made either of re-ordinations, or of their renouncing their own Rites ; in short, that in the administration of the Sacraments the only thing ever attended to, was to ascertain for certain whether the substance was found in them, without examining whether the Rites were either introduced or altered during the change and separation.

Supposing the truth of the facts such as we have given them, there remained nothing more than to shew that the Ordination of the English being faulty neither as to the Consecrator nor as to the matter and form, the re-ordinations of them are contrary to all the principles received by Divines ; that the examples which are made use of cannot even form an antecedent probability, much less be adduced as a proof ; that what has been done of this kind has no other foundation than the fable of the Nag's-head, or the false notion that the true form of Ordination consisted, in part at least, in the delivery of the instruments ; and that this foundation being without solidity, re-ordination becomes indefensible. This has been proved at great length in the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth chapters. For after having shewn in the thirteenth chapter, that the re-ordinations of them could be maintained neither by the practice of the contemporary Catholics nor by the opinions of the later Divines, we have given in the fourteenth chapter a detail of the principles contrary to re-ordination, and shewn that these principles apply no less to the English than to any other Church separated from the Catholics, because as soon as it has been proved that the substance of Ordination was preserved among them, there is no further difficulty as to the rest.

In fact, schism or heresy does not of itself annul a Sacrament. It has even been shewn in the ninth chapter that the heretical opinions of those who might be employed on the form of the new Ritual did not influence at all the validity or invalidity of the English Ordinations ; because, according to the opinion of Divines, only the alteration of the sense of the form can destroy its substance : *‘Additio verborum quæ debitum formæ Sacramentalis sensum corrumpunt, tollit*

The reordination of the English is therefore indefensible.

What alterations make a Sacrament null.

CHAP. XVII. *veritatem Sacramenti*: [The addition of words which destroy the due sense of the Sacramental form, puts an end to the reality of the Sacrament:] and it is not by the inward intention and the opinions of their compilers, that we judge of the validity of a form and of a Sacrament.

The doubt without foundation.

There is therefore no room for the doubt; and as it was shewn in the twelfth chapter, if there be many Divines who have really doubted of the validity of the English Ordinations, this doubt cannot any farther influence their Ordination than as it is supported by solid reasons, or by facts which form a kind of conviction. In this case, however, nothing of the kind is found. The facts resolve themselves either into fables, or into inductions so weak as to be evidently destroyed by the most authentic Records, by testimonies the most distinct, and by facts the least contested. The proofs which we have adduced of Barlow's consecration and of that of Parker, the comparison of the Roman Pontifical with Edward the Sixth's Ritual, the reading of various Acts of the Parliament of England, with abundance of other things of this nature, form in a matter of this kind demonstrations in favour of the English Ordinations, with which no reasonable doubt can subsist.

Comparison of the argument on the two sides.

As for the reasons which support the Ordinations, as they are all founded upon evident facts and authentic monuments, and as the opposite reasonings have no other foundation than mere possibilities in the air, and suspicions which aim at the annihilation of the most solemn Records; it does not appear that any comparison can be made between the two; and doubts which have for their foundation mere presumptions and prejudices, can never decide as to the validity or invalidity of a Sacrament, when these prejudices or these presumptions are destroyed by proofs which are convincing to all those, who seek less to dispute than to inform themselves.

Succession.

The Ordination being once ascertained, the succession was easy to establish. The same principles concur to prove the validity of the one and the continuation of the other. All depends on the Ordination of Parker, who, taking his source in the ancient Episcopate, re-unites it in his person to the new, and leaves no void to fill up which can make us suspect the least interruption.

Such, nearly, is the analysis of this Dissertation, which appears equally supported by the truth of the facts, and by that of the theological principles. If it has nothing new for the English, it will be able perhaps to undeceive many of our Divines, who sincerely seek the truth, and who have been unable to inform themselves, from the want of works of which they could easily make use. All the fruit it can produce with regard to the English is, that they will perceive that we desire nothing less than to deceive ourselves to their disadvantage, and that we are ready to sacrifice to truth and charity prejudices the most ancient and the most dear to self-love. It is in fact, according to St. Augustine, an indispensable duty on our part to love the truth equally whether she condemn us or caress us; and whatever it cost the side we have undertaken to maintain, we must not hesitate to pay her the homage she deserves, and which we cannot refuse her. We ought to be the more inclined to it, because the establishing of the English Ordinations turns entirely to the advantage of the Catholic Church. The acknowledgement of their validity facilitates to us the means of our re-union with the English, and there is nothing for which we ought to wish with greater ardour.

Though separated from us, they are still our brethren; nor is any thing foreign to us of that which is marked with the seal of Jesus Christ. I know there remain still abundance of obstacles to surmount: yet perhaps did we as much apply ourselves to overcome them as many do to perpetuate them, we should at length find the means to break down the wall of division which separates us, and to restore to the Catholic Church one of her most illustrious members. This is the sole end I have proposed to myself in this Treatise. What joy to me if the Lord, seconding my intentions, should make use of the weakest and most unworthy of His Ministers to co-operate in so holy a work! But whatever the event may be, it is still good to desire and to labour for it; and if the execution does not correspond to my wishes, I still promise myself the precious consolation of seeing my intentions approved by those who are well disposed.

General observations: tendency of the Work.

Conclusion.



[AUTHOR'S APPENDIX.]

PROOFS ESTABLISHING THE FACTS
ADVANCED IN THIS TREATISE.

ARTICLE I.

[TRANSLATION OF A] LETTER FROM THE LATE M. J. BEN. BOSSUET, BISHOP
OF MEAUX, TO DOM JOHN MABILLON ^a.

Germigny, Aug. 12. 1685.

MY REVEREND FATHER,

I received with joy the marks of your friendship, and you must not doubt that I value them as much as I esteem your virtue. I take virtue in all the senses of the country where you are ^b. I was delighted to hear that they gave you freer access to the Libraries there than they had ever given to any one, which makes us hope for new discoveries, always very useful to confirm the ancient doctrine and tradition of the Mother of Churches. We await the event of the affair of Molinos, which has not a little surprised every one, and particularly those who had known him at Rome. I know some that are so zealous in his behalf, that they choose to think that all that is done against him is the effect of some secret cabal, and that he will come out with credit. But what we see has not this appearance.

As to the business of England, besides the difficulty with respect to the first Bishops, the authors of the Schism, there is another great one at the time of Cromwell, when it is contended that the succession of the Ordination was interrupted. The English maintain the contrary; and as to the succession at the beginning of the Schism, they maintain that there is no difficulty; *and in this they seem to be in the right*. This depends on fact; and the holy See will not fail to act in this matter with its usual circumspection.

This reminds me of a thing which, according to all the news we hear, might much facilitate the return of England and Germany; which is

[^a See Preface, p. 21, 22.]

^b D. Mabillon was then at Rome.

of Preface, p. 21, 22.
of Church, p. 320.

the restoration of the Cup. It was restored by Pius the Fourth in Austria and Bavaria; but the remedy had no great effect, because men's minds were as yet too much heated. The same thing granted at a more favourable time, as this in which every thing appears in agitation, might succeed better. Could you not throw in a few words, and sound their opinions a little on this subject? For myself, I believe that by this concession, in which there is no inconvenience which we might not hope to surmount after an usage of thirteen hundred years, we should see the entire ruin of heresy. Already the greater part of our Huguenots explain themselves openly concerning it. As for our Articles^c, it is a more delicate subject, and on this point I think we should be contented with liberty. I salute D. Michel with all my heart, and am with a perfect cordiality, My Reverend Father,

Your very humble Servant,

✠ J. BENIGNE, Bishop of Meaux.

ARTICLE II.

VARIOUS STATUTES [I. E. ACTS, OR PORTIONS OF ACTS,] OF PARLIAMENT OF WHICH MENTION HAS BEEN MADE IN THIS WORK.

§ I. *Act of the Parliament held the twenty-sixth year of the Reign of Henry VIII. (A. D. 1535.) to declare the King Head of the Church of England. [26 Hen. VIII. c. 1.]*

^a ALBEIT the King's Majesty justly and rightfully is and ought to be the supreme head of the Church of England, and so is recognised by the Clergy of this Realm in their Convocations, yet nevertheless, for corroboration and confirmation thereof, and for increase of virtue in Christ's religion within this Realm of England, and to repress and extirp all errors, heresies, and other enormities and abuses heretofore used in the same: Be it enacted by authority of this present Parliament, that the King our Sovereign Lord, his heirs and successors, Kings of this Realm, shall be taken, accepted and reputed the only supreme head in earth of the Church of England, called *Anglicana Ecclesia*; (2) And shall have and enjoy, annexed and united to the Imperial Crown of this Realm, as well the title and style thereof, as all honours, dignities, preheminences, jurisdictions, privileges, authorities, immunities, profits, and commodities to the said dignity of supreme head of the same Church belonging and appertaining; (3) And that our said

^c This relates to the Four Articles of the Clergy [† of France.]

^a Statutes at Large, vol. 1. p. 436.

Sovereign Lord, his heirs and successors, Kings of this Realm, shall have full power and authority from time to time, to visit, repress, redress, reform, order, correct, restrain, and amend all such errors, heresies, abuses, offences, contempts, and enormities, whatsoever they be, which by any manner spiritual authority or jurisdiction ought, or may lawfully be reformed, repressed, ordered, redressed, corrected, restrained, or amended, most to the pleasure of Almighty God, the increase of virtue in Christ's religion, and for the conservation of the peace, unity, and tranquillity of this Realm: Any usage, custom, foreign laws, foreign authority, prescription, or any thing or things to the contrary hereof notwithstanding. *Rep.* 1 & 2 *P. & M.* 8. *St.* 8. *El.* 1.

II. ^b*Statute concerning the necessity of applying to the Archbishop of Canterbury, or to some Bishop, to have dispensations.* A. D. 1534. [25 *Hen. VIII.* c. 21. sect. 3.]

^cIII. AND be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid, That neither your Highness, your heirs nor successors, Kings of this Realm, nor any your subjects of this Realm, nor of any other your Dominions, shall from henceforth sue to the said Bishop of Rome, called the Pope, or to the See of Rome, or to any person or persons, having or pretending any authority by the same, for Licences, Dispensations, Compositions, Faculties, Grants, Rescripts, Delegacies, or any other Instruments or Writings, of what kind, name, nature, or quality soever they be of, for any cause or matter, for the which any Licence, Dispensation, . . . Instrument, or other Writing, heretofore hath been used and accustomed to be had and obtained at the See of Rome, or by authority thereof, or of any Prelates of this Realm: (2) nor for any manner of other Licences, Dispensations, . . . or any other Instruments or Writings, that in causes of necessity may lawfully be granted without offending the Holy Scriptures and Laws of God. (3) But that from henceforth every such Licence, Dispensation, . . . and other Writing aforesaid named and mentioned, necessary for your Highness, your heirs and successors, and your and their people and subjects, upon the due examinations of the causes and qualities of the persons procuring such Dispensations, Licences, . . . or other Writings, shall be granted, had and obtained from time to time, within this your Realm, and other your Dominions, and not elsewhere, (4) in manner and form following, and none otherwise: That is to say, The Archbishop of Canterbury for the time being, and his successors, shall have power and authority from time to time, by their discretions, to give, grant, and dispose by an Instrument under the seal of

^b This Statute proves that they did not regard the King as Head of the Church *in spiritualibus* [in things spiritual.]
^c Statutes at Large, vol. 1. p. 127.

the said Archbishop, unto your Majesty, and to your heirs and successors, Kings of this Realm, as well all manner such Licences, Dispensations, and all other Writings, for causes not being contrary or repugnant to the Holy Scriptures and Laws of God, as heretofore hath been used and accustomed to be had and obtained by your Highness, or any your most noble progenitors, or any of your or their subjects, at the See of Rome, or any person or persons by authority of the same : (5) and all other Licences, Dispensations, Faculties, and other Writings, in, for, and upon, all such causes and matters as shall be convenient and necessary to be had, for the honour and surety of your Highness, your heirs and successors, and the wealth and profit of this your Realm : (6) So that the said Archbishop or any of his successors, in no manner wise shall grant any Dispensation, Licence, Rescript, or any other Writing afore rehearsed, for any cause or matter repugnant to the Law of Almighty God.

In the same chapter, Sect. IV. and V, the Archbishop is ordered to grant only the ordinary dispensations ; but those that are not in use he is prohibited to grant without the King's consent. And in Sect. XVII. it is said, that if the Archbishop refuses to grant the dispensation, the Chancellor or the Keeper of the Great Seal shall judge whether the refusal be just and reasonable ; that if it appear so to them, it shall be approved ; but if it appear to them unjust, [and owing to contempt of the Act], they shall order the Archbishop to grant the dispensation required ; in default of which he shall incur such penalty as it shall please the King [beforehand, in the Writ of Injunction,] to impose upon him, and the King shall appoint two other Prelates to grant the dispensation necessary ; a proof that they never pretended to act in things spiritual independently of the Ecclesiastical authority.

Statutes concerning the Consecration of Bishops.

§ III. *Statute of the Parliament held the twenty-fifth year of Henry VIII.* [Latter part of] chap. 20. A.D. 1534. [25 Hen. VIII. c. 20. § 5—7.]

^d V. AND be it enacted by the authority aforesaid, That whensoever any such presentment or nomination shall be made by the King's Highness, his heirs or successors, by virtue and authority of this Act, and according to the tenour of the same : That then every Archbishop and Bishop, to whose hands any such presentment and nomination shall be directed, shall with

^d Ibid. p. 425, 426.

all speed and celerity, invest and consecrate the person nominate and presented by the King's Highness, his heirs or successors, to the office and dignity that such person shall be so presented unto, and give and use to him Pall, and all other benedictions, ceremonies, and things requisite for the same, without suing, procuring, or obtaining hereafter any Bulls, or other things at the See of Rome, for any such office or dignity in that behalf.

(2) . . . (6) And then after he hath made such oath and fealty only to the King's Majesty, his heirs and successors, as shall be limited for the same, the King's Highness, by his Letters Patents under his Great Seal, shall signify the said election to one Archbishop, and two other Bishops, or else to four Bishops within this Realm, or within any other the King's Dominions, to be assigned by the King's Highness, his heirs or successors, requiring and commanding the said Archbishop and Bishops with all speed and celerity to confirm the said election, and to invest and consecrate the said person so elected to the office and dignity that he is elected unto, and to give and use to him such Pall, benedictions, ceremonies, and all other things requisite for the same, without suing, procuring or obtaining any Bulls, Briefs, or other things at the said See of Rome, or by the authority thereof in any behalf.

VI. And be it further enacted by authority aforesaid, That every person and persons being hereafter chosen, elected, nominate, presented, invested, and consecrated to the dignity or office of any Archbishop or Bishop within this Realm, or within any other the King's Dominions, according to the form, tenour, and effect of this present Act, and suing their temporalities out of the King's hands, his heirs or successors, as hath been accustomed, and making a corporal oath to the King's Highness, and to none other, in form as is afore rehearsed, shall and may from henceforth be trononised or installed, as the case shall require, (2) and shall have and take their only restitution out of the King's hands, of all the possessions and profits spiritual and temporal belonging to the said Archbishoprick or Bishoprick whereunto they shall be so elected or presented, and shall be obeyed in all manner of things, according to the name, title, degree, and dignity that they shall be so chosen or presented unto, and do and execute in every thing and things touching the same, as any Archbishop or Bishop of this Realm, without offending of the prerogative royal of the Crown, and the laws and customs of this Realm, might at any time heretofore do.

VII. And be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid, That if the Prior and Covent of any Monastery, or Dean and Chapter of any Cathedral Church where the See of an Archbishop or Bishop is, within any the King's Dominions, after such licence as is afore rehearsed shall be delivered to them, proceed not to election, and signify the same, according to the tenour of this Act, within the space of twenty days next after such licence shall come to their hands ; (2) or else if any Archbishop or Bishop within any

the King's Dominions, after any such election, nomination or presentation shall be signified unto them by the King's Letters Patents, shall refuse, and do not confirm, invest, and consecrate, with all due circumstance, as is aforesaid, every such person as shall be so elected, nominate, or presented, and to them signified, as is above mentioned, within twenty days next after the King's Letters Patents of such signification or presentation shall come to their hands, (3) or else if any of them, or any other person or persons, admit, maintain, allow, obey, do, or execute any censures, excommunications, interdictions, inhibitions, or any other process or act, of what nature, name, or quality soever it be, to the contrary or let of due execution of this Act, (4) that then every Prior and particular person of his Covent, and every Dean and particular person of the Chapter, and every Archbishop and Bishop, and all other persons so offending and doing contrary to this Act, or any part thereof, and their aiders, counsellors, abettors, shall run in the dangers, pains and penalties of the Estatute of Provision and *Præmunire*, made in the five and twentieth year of the reign of King Edward the Third, and in the sixteenth year of King Richard the Second."

Statutes for the Book of Consecration of Bishops [&c.], made under Edward the Sixth in the Parliaments of 1549 and 1552.

§ IV.—*Act of the Year 1549, to order the drawing up of a new Form of Ordination.* [3 & 4 Ed. VI. c. 12.]

[From Rastal's Abridgment.]

^e SUCH Form and manner of Making and Consecrating of Archbishops, Bishops, Priests, Deacons, and other Ministers of the Church, as by six Prelates, and six other men of this Realm learned in God's law, by the King to be appointed and assigned, or by the most number of them, shall be devised for that purpose, and set forth under the Great Seal before the first of April next coming, shall be lawfully exercised and used, and none other.

§ V.—*Statute of the year 1552, to annex the Book of Ordination to that of Common Prayer.* [5 & 6 Ed. VI. c. 1. sect. 5.]

^f V. AND because there hath risen in the use and exercise of the aforesaid Common Service in the Church, heretofore set forth, divers doubts for the fashion and manner of the ministrations of the same, rather by the curiosity of the minister and mistakers, than of any other worthy cause; (2) therefore, as well for the more plain and manifest explanation thereof, as for the more perfection of the said Order or Common Service, in some places where it is necessary to make the same Prayer and fashion of Service

^e Ibid. c. 12. p. 674.

^f Ibid. c. 1. p. 676.

more earnest and fit to stir Christian people to the true honouring of Almighty God, (3) The King's most excellent Majesty, with the assent of the Lords and Commons in this present Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, hath caused the aforesaid Order of Common Service, entituled, The Book of Common-Prayer, to be faithfully and godly perused, explained, and made fully perfect, and by the aforesaid authority hath annexed and joined it, so explained and perfected, to this present Statute; (4) ADDING ALSO a Form and Manner of Making and Consecrating of Archbishops, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, to be of like force, authority, and value, as the same like foresaid book, entituled, The Book of Common-Prayer, was before, and to be accepted, received, used, and esteemed in like sort and manner, and with the same clauses of provisions and exceptions, to all intents, constructions, and purposes, as by the Act of Parliament made in the second year of the King's Majesty's reign, was ordained, limited, expressed, and appointed for the Uniformity of Service and Administration of the Sacraments throughout the Realm, upon such several pains as in the said Act of Parliament is expressed: (5) And the said former Act to stand in full force and strength, to all intents and constructions, and to be applied, practised, and put in ure, to and for the establishing of the Book of Common Prayer, now explained, and hereunto annexed, and also the said Form of Making of Archbishops, Bishops, or Priests and Deacons, hereunto annexed, as it was for the former Book.

§ VI.—*Act of the Parliament held the first year of the Reign of Mary in 1553, for the repeal of the two preceding Acts made under Edward the Sixth.* [1 *Mary*, Sess. 2. c. 2.]

The Act is not given entire, but only in an abbreviated form, in these words.

[*From Rastal's Abridgment.*]

§ A Repeal of the Stat. of 3 Ed. VI. 12. made for the Ordering of Ecclesiastical Ministers, and of the Stat. of 5 Ed. VI. 1. made for the Uniformity of Common-Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments, . . All such Divine Service and Administration of Sacraments, as were most commonly used in England in the last year of King Henry the Eighth, shall be used thorow the Realm, after the twentieth day of December A.D. 1553. and no other kind of Service, nor Administrations of Sacraments.

§ VII.—*Statute of the year 1559, under Queen Elizabeth, for the restoration of The Book of Common Prayer drawn up under Edward the Sixth.* [1 *Eliz.* c. 2. sect. 1—3.]

^h WHERE at the death of our late Sovereign Lord King Edward the

^g *Ibid.* c. 2. p. 709.

^h *Ibid.* c. 2. p. 763.

Sixthⁱ, there remained one Uniform Order of Common Service and Prayer, and of the Administration of Sacraments, Rites, and Ceremonies of the Church of England, which was set forth in one Book, intituled, The Book of Common Prayer, and Administration of Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonies in the Church of England, authorised by Act of Parliament, holden in the fifth and sixth years of our said late Sovereign Lord King Edward the Sixth, intituled, An Act for the Uniformity of Common Prayer, and Administration of the Sacraments; the which was repealed and taken away by Act of Parliament in the first year of the reign of our late Sovereign Lady Queen Mary, to the great decay of the due honour of God, and discomfort to the professors of the truth of Christ's religion:

II. Be it therefore enacted by the authority of this present Parliament, That the said Estatute of Repeal, and every thing therein contained, only concerning the said Book, and the Service, Administration of the Sacraments, Rites and Ceremonies, contained or appointed in or by the said Book, shall be void and of none effect, from and after the Feast of the Nativity of St. John Baptist next coming; (2) And that the said Book with the Order of Service, and of the Administration of Sacraments, Rites, and Ceremonies, with the alterations and additions therein added and appointed by this Estatute, shall stand and be, from and after the said Feast of the Nativity of St. John Baptist, in full force and effect, according to the tenour and effect of this Estatute; Any thing in the aforesaid Estatute of Repeal to the contrary notwithstanding.

III. And further be it enacted by the Queen's Highness, with the assent of the Lords and Commons in this present Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, That all and singular Ministers in any Cathedral or Parish Church or other place within this Realm of England, Wales, and the Marches of the same, or other the Queen's Dominions, shall from and after the Feast of the Nativity of St. John Baptist next coming, be bounden to say and use the Mattens, Even-song, Celebration of the Lord's Supper, and Administration of each of the Sacraments, and all the Common and open Prayer, in such order and form as is mentioned in the said Book so authorised by Parliament in the said fifth and sixth years of the reign of King Edward the Sixth, with one alteration or addition of certain Lessons to be used on every Sunday in the year, and the Form of the Letany altered and corrected, and two sentences only added in the delivery of the Sacrament to the Communicants, and none other or otherwise.

§ VIII.—*Statute of the Parliament of the year 1566, touching the Validity of the Ordinations made since 1559.* [8 *Eliz. c. 2. sect. 1—5.*]

^k Forasmuch as divers questions by overmuch boldness of speech and

ⁱ In the printed text "Henry" has been put by mistake for "Edward." [See the Editor's notes.]

^k Statutes at Large, vol. 1. p. 814—816.

talk, amongst many of the common sort of people being unlearned, hath lately grown upon the Making and Consecrating of Archbishops and Bishops within this Realm, whether the same were and be duly and orderly done according to the law or not, which is much tending to the slander of all the state of Clergy, being one of the greatest states of this Realm: (2) Therefore, for the avoiding of such slanderous speech, and to the intent that every man that is willing to know the truth, may plainly understand that the same evil speech and talk is not grounded upon any just matter or cause, It is thought convenient hereby partly to touch such authorities as do allow and approve the Making and Consecrating of the same Archbishops and Bishops to be duly and orderly done according to the laws of this Realm, and thereupon further to provide for the more surety thereof, as hereafter shall be expressed. II. . . .¹

III. Wherefore for the plain declaration of all the premisses, and to the intent that the same may the better be known to every of the Queen's Majesty's subjects, whereby such evil speech as heretofore hath been used against the high state of Prelacy, may hereafter cease, (2) Be it now declared and enacted by the authority of this present Parliament, that the said Act and Statute made in the first year of the reign of our said Sovereign Lady the Queen's Majesty, whereby the said Book of Common Prayer and the Administration of Sacraments, with other Rites and Ceremonies, is authorised and allowed to be used, shall stand and remain good and perfect to all respects and purposes: (3) And that such Order and Form for the Consecrating of Archbishops and Bishops, and for the Making of Priests, Deacons, and Ministers, as was set forth in the time of the said late King Edward the Sixth, and added to the said Book of Common Prayer, and authorised by Parliament in the fifth and sixth years of the said late King, shall stand and be in full force and effect, and shall from henceforth be used and observed, in all places within this Realm, and other the Queen's Majesty's Dominions and Countries:

IV. And that all Acts and things heretofore had, made, or done by any person or persons, in or about any Consecration, Confirmation, or Investing of any person or persons elected to the office or dignity of any Archbishop or Bishop within this Realm, or within any other the Queen's Majesty's Dominions or Countries, by virtue of the Queen's Majesty's Letters Patents or Commission sithence the beginning of her Majesty's reign, be and shall be by authority of this present Parliament, declared, judged, and deemed, at and from every of the several times of the doing thereof, good and perfect to all respects and purposes; Any matter or thing that can or may be objected to the contrary thereof in any wise notwithstanding:

V. And that all persons that have been or shall be Made, Ordered, or

¹ I have not thought it necessary to copy here without use the declaration of what was done, but have satisfied myself with giving what the Parliament ordered.

Consecrate Archbishops, Bishops, Priests, Ministers of God's Holy Word and Sacraments, or Deacons, after the Form and Order prescribed in the said Order and Form how Archbishops, Bishops, Priests, Deacons and Ministers should be Consecrated, Made, and Ordered, be in very deed, and also by authority hereof declared and enacted to be, and shall be, Archbishops, Bishops, Priests, Ministers, and Deacons, and rightly Made, Ordered, and Consecrated; Any Statute, Law, Canon, or other thing to the contrary notwithstanding."

It follows clearly from this Statute, that it is not the Parliament that gives the Ordination its validity, but that it presupposes it, recognises it, and in consequence declares it.

§ IX. *Act of the Parliament held the thirty-ninth year of the Reign of Elizabeth, in 1597, to confirm the Deposition of the old Bishops and other Dignitaries, and the substitution of the new ones.* [39 Eliz. c. 8.]

^mWhereas divers and sundry persons exercising the office and function of Bishops and Deans of divers Sees and Bishopricks and Deanries within this Realm in the reign of our late Sovereign Lady Queen Mary, were, before the tenth day of November in the fourth year of the most happy and blessed government of the Queen's most excellent Majesty that now is, lawfully and justly deprived from such Bishopricks and Deanries as they severally enjoyed and took upon them to hold, and in their steads and places sundry excellent and worthy men duly preferred to the same: (2) And whereas the parties so deprived did notwithstanding, as it is pretended, make secret appeals, and used other secret means, pretending thereby to support the continuance of their said offices and functions:

II. Be it therefore declared and enacted by authority of this present Parliament, That all and every deprivation and deprivations, and all and every sentence and sentences of deprivation whatsoever, had, pronounced, or given at any time between the beginning of the reign of the Queen's most excellent Majesty that now is, and the tenth day of November in the fourth year of the same, against any person or persons which was, or took upon him to be, Archbishop or Bishop of any See or Bishoprick, or Dean of any Deanry, within this Realm, or any the Dominions thereof, in the reign of the said late Queen Mary, from such See or Bishoprick, shall be adjudged, deemed, and taken, good and sufficient in law, to all intents and purposes, and so shall remain and continue; Any appeal, exception, or other matter or thing whatsoever, to the contrary thereof in any wise notwithstanding.

III. And be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid, That all such Archbishops and Bishops, and Deans, as were Ordained or Made by the authority or licence of the Queen's Majesty that now is, at any time between

^m Statutes at Large, vol. 1. p. 922.

the beginning of her reign and the said tenth day of November in the fourth year of her Majesty's reign, shall be taken and adjudged to be lawful Archbishop or Bishop of the See or Bishoprick, and Dean of the Deanry unto the which he was so preferred, assigned, or appointed: (2) And that the same See of Archbishoprick or Bishoprick and Deanry unto which he was so preferred, assigned, or appointed, shall be deemed and adjudged to be merely void to all respects and purposes, before such presentment, appointment, or assignment, so made as aforesaid; Any ambiguity or question in that behalf heretofore made, or hereafter to be made, to the contrary in any wise notwithstanding.

It is plain, as we see by the terms of this Act, that what is here treated of is not at all the validity of the Ordinations, or doubts raised on this subject, but simply whether the Sees were lawfully vacant by the deposition of the persons who filled them, and whether the substitution of those who were put into their places was also lawful.

ARTICLE III.^a

EXTRACT FROM THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER, AND FROM THE FORMULARY OF ORDINATIONS, WHICH WAS JOINED TO IT BY A STATUTE OF THE PARLIAMENT OF THE YEAR 1552.

We remarked in the first and eighth chapters, that in 1549 Edward the Sixth had the Formulary of Ordinations reformed, and that in 1552 the Parliament authorised it, joined it to the Book of Common Prayer, and ordered it to be used, as forming part of that Book. It is from this Formulary thus reformed and authorised, that I have extracted the Form of Ordering Priests and Bishops, which I have thought it expedient to join to the Proofs, in order that every one may be convinced for himself, that in this Formulary all the substance of the Roman Pontifical has been preserved. I have omitted the Ordering of Deacons, as not being at all necessary.

[^a In both Mr. Williams's Editions *the whole of this Article* is omitted, and in its stead the following mis-statement inserted at the end of the preceding Article:

"N.B. The author had here inserted the "greatest part of our Ordinal, as it has "stood since King Charles the Second's "reign, but the translator has thought fit "to omit it, because it is in every English "reader's hands; and therefore he has "omitted it, and only inserted [*in Ed. I.* and "therefore he has contented himself with

"inserting] the variations between it and "the old Ordinal of Edward the Sixth, as "follows."

Now, as it happens, and as Courayer has himself clearly stated in the first paragraph of the Article, it is from the Ordinal not "as it has stood since King Charles the Second's reign," but *as it stood before that time*, that he has given the Extract. The importance of this difference, and of Mr. Williams's *twice repeated* mutilation itself, will be obvious.—ED.]

As it was judged proper to make some further changes in this Ordinal (as the English call it) in the time of Charles the Second, after this Extract will be found the changes which were made therein; in order to omit nothing which might lead to a suspicion that we wished to suppress any thing which might concern either of the two parties.

It will be necessary to inform the reader, that the Latin translation^b of the Book of Ordinations, which is here made use of, may be regarded as an original like the English, this translation having been authorised in the Realm^c. It is different from that of which I have made use in the quotations scattered through the Treatise; as I have taken these quotations from the Translation of the Ritual as reformed under Charles the Second, but the difference is only in the style, and not at all in the sense^d.

¶ THE FORM OF ORDERING PRIESTS.

¶ *When the Exhortation [such as is described in the Ordination of Deacons^e] is ended, then shall follow the Communion. And for the Epistle shall be read out of the twentieth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles as followeth.*

From Mileto Paul sent messengers more blessed to give than to receive. [v. 17—35.]

Or else this third chapter of the first Epistle to Timothy.

This is a true saying, received up in glory.

After this shall be read for the Gospel a piece of the last chapter of Matthew, as followeth :

Jesus came . . . until the end of the world. *Matt. xxviii.* [v. 18—20.]

Or else this that followeth, of the tenth chapter of John.

Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that entereth not . . . one fold and one shepherd. [v. 1—16.]

Or else this, of the twentieth chapter of John.

The same day at night, . . . they are retained. [v. 19—23.]

When the Gospel is ended, then shall be said or sung,

† Come, Holy Ghost, eternal God,—proceeding from above,
Both from the Father and the Son,—the God of peace and love ;

[^b This paragraph applies only to the French Edition : see the Editor's notes.]

[^c ^d See the Editor's notes.]

[^e These words are inserted for explanation as in the Latin given by Courayer.—Ed.]

† Veni, Creator Spiritus,
Mentes tuorum visita :
Imple supernâ gratiâ
Quæ tu creasti pectora.

Qui Paraclîtus diceris,
Donum Dei altissimi,
Fons vivus, ignis, charitas,
Et spiritalis unctio.
Tu septiformis munere,
Dextræ Dei tu digitus,
Tu ritè promissum Patris,
Sermone ditans guttura.
Accende lumen sensibus,
Infunde amorem cordibus ;

Visite our minds, and into us—thy heav'nly grace inspire,
 That in all truth and godliness—we may have true desire.
 Thou art the very Comforter,—in all woe and distress,
 The heav'nly gift of God most high,—which no tongue can express ;
 The fountain and the lively spring—of joy celestiall,
 The fire so bright, the love so clear,—and unction spir'tuall.
 Thou in thy gifts art manifold,—whereby Christ's Church doth stand ;
 In faithful hearts writing thy law,—the finger of God's hand.
 According to thy promise made—thou givest speech of grace,
 That through thy help the praise of God—may sound in every place.
 O Holy Ghost, into our wits—send down thine heav'nly light,
 Kindle our hearts with fervent love,—to serve God day and night ;
 Strength and stablishe all our weakness,—so feeble and so frail,
 That neither flesh, the world, nor dev'l—against us do prevail ;
 Put back our en'my far from us,—and graunt us to obtain
 Peace in our hearts with God and man,—without grudge or disdain.
 And graunt, O Lord, that, thou being—our Leader and our Guide,
 We may eschew the snares of sin,—and from thee never slide.
 To us such plenty of thy grace,—good Lord, graunt, we thee pray,
 That thou may'st be our Comforter—at the last dreadful day.
 Of all strife and dissensiön,—O Lord, dissolve the bands,
 And make the knots of peace and love—throughout all Christen lands.
 Graunt us, O Lord, through thee to know—the Father most of might,
 That of his dear beloved Son—we may attain the sight :
 And that with perfect faith alsó—we may acknowledge thee
 The Spíríte of them both alwáy,—one God in Persons three.
 Laud and praise be to the Father,—and to the Son equáll,
 And to the Holy Sp'rite alsó,—one God co-éternáll.
 And pray we that the only Son—vouchsafed his Sp'rite to send,
 To all that do profess his name—unto the worldes end. Amen.

And then the Archdeacon shall present unto the Bishop all them that shall receive the Order of Priesthood that day ; the Archdeacon saying,

Reverend Father in God, I present unto you these persons present, to be admitted to the Order of Priesthood, *Cum interrogazione et responsione, ut in Ordine Diaconatus.*

And then the Bishop shall say to the people,

Good people, these be they whom we purpose, God willing, to receive this day unto the holy office of Priesthood. For after due examination we find not the contrary but that they be lawfully called to their function and ministry, and that they be persons meet for the same : but yet if there be

Infirma nostri corporis
 Virtute firmans perpeti.
 Hostem repellas longius,
 Pacemque dones protinus,
 Ductore sic te prævio
 Vitemus omne noxium.
 Per te sciamus da Patrem,

Noscamus atque Filium ;
 Te utriusque Spiritum
 Credamus omni tempore.
 Sit laus Patri cum Filio,
 Sancto simul Paráclito ;
 Nobisque mittat Filius
 Charisma Sancti Spiritús.

any of you which knoweth any impediment or notable crime in any of them, for the which he ought not to be received into this holy ministry, now in the name of God declare the same.

And if any great crime or impediment be objected, &c. ut supra in Ordine Diaconatus usque ad finem Litaniae cum hac Collecta :

Almighty God, giver of all good things, which by thy Holy Spirit hast appointed diverse orders of Ministers in thy Church ; Mercifully behold these thy servants, now called to the office of Priesthood, and replenish them so with the truth of thy doctrine, and innocency of life, that, both by word and good example, they may faithfully serve thee in this office, to the glory of thy name, and profit of the congregation, through the merits of our Saviour Jesu Christ ; who liveth and reigneth with thee and the Holy Ghost, world without end. Amen.

Then the Bishop shall minister unto every of them the oath concerning the King's supremacy, as it is set out in the Order of Deacons. And that done, he shall say unto them which are appointed to receive the said office as hereafter followeth :

You have heard, brethren, as well in your private examination, as in the exhortation, and in the holy lessons taken out of the Gospel, and of the writings of the Apostles, of what dignity and of how great importance this office is (whereunto ye be called). And now we exhort you, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, to have in remembrance into how high a dignity, and to how chargeable an office ye be called, that is to say, to be the messengers, the watchmen, the pastors, and the stewards of the Lord ; to teach, to premonish, to feed, and provide for the Lord's family ; to seek for Christ's sheep that be dispersed abroad, and for his children which be in the midst of this naughty world, to be saved through Christ for ever. Have always, therefore, printed in your remembrance how great a treasure is committed to your charge ; for they be the sheep of Christ which be bought with his death, and for whom he shed his blood. The Church and congregation whom you must serve is his spouse and his body ; and if it shall chance the same church, or any member thereof, to take any hurt or hindrance, by reason of your negligence, ye know the greatness of the fault, and also of the horrible punishment which will ensue. Wherefore consider with yourselves the end of your ministry towards the children of God, toward the spouse and body of Christ, and see that you never cease your labour, your care, and diligence, until you have done all that lieth in you, according to your bounden duty, to bring all such as are or shall be committed to your charge, unto that agreement in faith, and knowledge of God, and to that ripeness and perfectness of age in Christ, that there be no place left among them, either for error in religion or for viciousness in life.

Then, forasmuch as your office is both of so great excellency and of so great difficulty, ye see with how great care and study ye ought to apply yourselves, as well that you may shew yourselves kind to that Lord, who

hath placed you in so high a dignity, as also to beware that neither you yourselves offend, neither be occasion that other offend. Howbeit ye cannot have a mind and a will thereto of yourselves; for that power and ability is given of God alone. Therefore ye see how ye ought and have need earnestly to pray for his Holy Spirit. And seeing that you cannot by any other means compass the doing of so weighty a work, pertaining to the salvation of man, but with doctrine and exhortation taken out of holy Scripture, and with a life agreeable unto the same; ye perceive how studious ye ought to be in reading and in learning the holy Scriptures, and in framing the manners both of yourselves and of them that specially pertain unto you, according to the rule of the same Scriptures. And for this selfsame cause ye see how you ought to forsake and set aside (as much as you may) all worldly cares and studies.

We have a good hope that you have well weighed and pondered these things with yourselves long before this time, and that you have clearly determined, by God's grace, to give yourselves wholly to this vocation, whereunto it hath pleased God to call you, so that, (as much as lieth in you) you apply yourselves wholly to this one thing, and draw all your cares and studies this way, and to this end. And that you will continually pray for the heavenly assistance of the Holy Ghost, from God the Father, by the mediation of our only Mediator and Saviour Jesus Christ, that by daily reading and weighing of the Scriptures ye may wax riper and stronger in your ministry. And that ye may so endeavour yourselves, from time to time, to sanctify the lives of you and yours, and to fashion them after the rule and doctrine of Christ. And that ye may be wholesome and godly examples and patterns for the rest of the congregation to follow. And that this present congregation of Christ, here assembled, may also understand your minds and wills in these things; and that this your promise shall more move you to do your duties, ye shall answer plainly to these things, which we, in the name of the congregation, shall demand of you, touching the same.

Do you think in your heart that you be truly called, according to the will of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the order of this Church of England, to the ministry of Priesthood?

Answer. I think it.

The Bishop. Be you persuaded that the holy Scriptures contain sufficiently all doctrine required of necessity for eternal salvation, through faith in Jesu Christ? And are you determined, with the said Scriptures to instruct the people committed to your charge, and to teach nothing (as required of necessity to eternal salvation) but that you shall be persuaded may be concluded and proved by the Scripture?

Answer. I am so persuaded, and have so determined by God's grace.

The Bishop. Will you then give your faithful diligence always so to minister the doctrine, and Sacraments, and the discipline of Christ, as the

Lord hath commanded, and as this realm hath received the same, according to the commandments of God, so that you may teach the people committed to your cure and charge with all diligence to keep and observe the same ?

Answer. I will so do, by the help of the Lord.

The Bishop. Will you be ready, with all faithful diligence, to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrines, contrary to God's word, and to use both public and private monitions and exhortations, as well to the sick as to the whole, within your cures, as need shall require and occasion be given ?

Answer. I will, the Lord being my helper.

The Bishop. Will you be diligent in prayers, and in reading of the holy Scriptures, and in such studies as help to the knowledge of the same, laying aside the study of the world and the flesh ?

Answer. I will endeavour myself so to do, the Lord being my helper.

The Bishop. Will you be diligent to frame and fashion your own selves and your families according to the doctrine of Christ, and to make both yourselves and them (as much as in you lieth) wholesome examples and spectacles to the flock of Christ ?

Answer. I will so apply myself, the Lord being my helper.

The Bishop. Will you maintain and set forwards (as much as lieth in you) quietness, peace, and love amongst all Christian people, and specially among them that are, or shall be, committed to your charge ?

Answer. I will so do, the Lord being my helper.

The Bishop. Will you reverently obey your Ordinary, and other chief ministers, unto whom the government and charge is committed over you, following with a glad mind and will their godly admonition, and submitting yourselves to their godly judgments ?

Answer. I will so do, the Lord being my helper.

Then shall the Bishop say,

Almighty God, who hath given you this will to do all these things ; Grant also unto you strength and power to perform the same, that he may accomplish his work which he hath begun in you, until the time he shall come at the latter day to judge the quick and the dead.

After this, the congregation shall be desired, secretly in their prayers, to make humble supplications to God for the foresaid things : for the which prayers there shall be a certain space kept in silence.

That done, the Bishop shall pray in this wise.

¶ Let us pray.

Almighty God and heavenly Father, which of thy infinite love and goodness towards us, hast given to us thy only and most dear beloved Son Jesus Christ, to be our Redeemer and Author of everlasting life : who, after he had made perfect our redemption by his death, and was ascended into heaven, sent abroad into the world his apostles, prophets, evangelists,

doctors, and pastors; by whose labour and ministry he gathered together a great flock in all the parts of the world, to set forth the eternal praise of thy holy name: For these so great benefits of thy eternal goodness, and for that thou hast vouchsafed to call these thy servants here present to the same office and ministry of the salvation of mankind, we render unto thee most hearty thanks, we worship and praise thee; and we humbly beseech thee, by the same thy Son, to grant unto all us, which either here or elsewhere call upon thy name, that we may shew ourselves thankful to thee for these and all other thy benefits, and that we may daily increase and go forwards in the knowledge and faith of thee, and thy Son, by the Holy Spirit. So that as well by these thy Ministers, as by them to whom they shall be appointed Ministers, thy holy name may be always glorified, and thy blessed kingdom enlarged; through the same thy Son our Lord Jesus Christ, which liveth and reigneth with thee, in the unity of the same Holy Spirit, world without end. Amen.

¶ *When this prayer is done, the Bishop, with the Priests present, shall lay their hands severally upon the head of every one that receiveth Orders; the receivers humbly kneeling upon their knees, and the Bishop saying,*

Receive the Holy Ghost: whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven; and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained. And be thou a faithful dispenser of the word of God, and of his holy Sacraments; In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

¶ *The Bishop shall deliver to every one of them the Bible in his hand, saying,*

Take thou authority to preach the word of God, and to minister the holy Sacraments, in this congregation, where thou shalt be so appointed.

¶ *When this is done, the congregation shall sing the Creed, and also they shall go to the Communion; which all they that receive Orders shall take together, and remain in the same place where the hands were laid upon them, until such time as they have received the Communion.*

¶ *The Communion being done, after the last Collect, and immediately before the Benediction, shall be said this Collect:*

Most merciful Father, we beseech thee so to send upon these thy servants thy heavenly blessing, that they may be clad about with all justice, and that thy word spoken by their mouths may have such success, that it may never be spoken in vain. Grant also that we may have grace to hear and receive the same as thy most holy word, and the mean of our salvation, that in all our words and deeds we may seek thy glory, and the increase of thy kingdom; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

¶ *And if the Orders of Deacon and Priesthood be given both upon one day, then shall all things at the holy Communion be used as they are appointed at the Ordering of Priests; saving that for the Epistle the whole third chapter of the first to Timothy shall be read as it is set out before in the Order of Priests. And immediately after the Epistle the Deacons shall be ordered. And it shall suffice, the Litany to be said once.*

¶ THE FORM OF CONSECRATING OF AN ARCHBISHOP
OR BISHOP.

¶ At the Communion.

The Epistle. 1 Tim. iii. [1—6.] This is a true saying, . . . lest he fall into rebuke and snare of the evil speaker.

The Gospel. John xxi. [15—17.] Jesus said to Simon Peter, . . . Feed my sheep.

¶ Or else out of the tenth chapter of John, as before, in the Order of Priests.

¶ After the Gospel and Credo ended, first the elected Bishop shall be presented by two Bishops unto the Archbishop of that Province, or to some other Bishop appointed by his commission; the Bishops that present him saying,

Most Reverend Father in God, we present unto you this godly and well learned man to be consecrated Bishop.

¶ Then shall the Archbishop demand the King's mandate for the consecration, and cause it to be read; and the oath touching the knowledge of the King's supremacy shall be ministered to the person elected, as it is set out in the Order of Deacons. And then shall be ministered also the oath of due obedience unto the Archbishop, as followeth:

¶ *The Oath of due Obedience to the Archbishop.*

In the name of God, Amen. I, *N.* chosen Bishop of the Church and See of *N.* do profess and promise all due reverence and obedience to the Archbishop, and to the metropolitichurch of *N.* and to their successors: So help me God, through Jesus Christ.

¶ This oath shall not be made at the consecration of an Archbishop.

¶ Then the Archbishop shall move the congregation present to pray; saying thus to them:

Brethren, it is written in the Gospel of Saint Luke, that our Saviour Christ continued the whole night in prayer, or ever that he did choose and send forth his twelve apostles. It is written also in the Acts of the Apostles, that the disciples which were at Antioch did fast and pray, or ever they laid hands upon, or sent forth Paul and Barnabas. Let us, therefore, following the example of our Saviour Christ and his apostles, first fall to prayer, or that we admit and send forth this person presented unto us, to the work whereunto we trust the Holy Ghost hath called him.

¶ And then shall be said the Litany, as afore in the Order of Deacons. And after this place,
"that it may please thee to illuminate all Bishops," &c. he shall say,

That it may please thee to bless this our brother elected, and to send thy grace upon him, that he may duly execute the office whereunto he is called, to the edifying of thy church, and to the honour, praise, and glory of thy name.

Answer. We beseech thee to hear us, good Lord.

¶ *Concluding the Litany in the end with this prayer :*

Almighty God, giver of all good things, which by thy Holy Spirit hast appointed diverse orders of ministers in thy church; Mercifully behold this thy servant, now called to the work and ministry of a Bishop; and replenish him so with the truth of thy doctrine and innocency of life, that both by word and deed he may faithfully serve thee in this office, to the glory of thy name, and profit of thy congregation; through the merits of our Saviour Jesu Christ, who liveth and reigneth with thee and the Holy Ghost world without end. Amen.

¶ *Then the Archbishop, sitting in a chair, shall say this to him that is to be consecrated.*

Brother, forasmuch as holy Scripture and the old canons commandeth that we should not be hasty in laying on hands, and admitting of any person to the government of the congregation of Christ, which he hath purchased with no less price than the effusion of his own blood; afore that I admit you to this administration whereunto ye are called, I will examine you in certain articles, to the end the congregation present may have a trial and bear witness how ye be minded to behave yourself in the church of God. Are you persuaded that you be truly called to this ministration, according to the will of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the order of this realm?

Answer. I am so persuaded.

The Archbishop. Are you persuaded that the holy Scriptures contain sufficiently all doctrine required of necessity for eternal salvation, through the faith in Jesu Christ? And are you determined, with the same holy Scriptures, to instruct the people committed to your charge, and to teach or maintain nothing, as required of necessity to eternal salvation, but that you shall be persuaded may be concluded and proved by the same?

Answer. I am so persuaded and determined by God's grace.

The Archbishop. Will you then faithfully exercise yourself in the said holy Scriptures, and call upon God by prayer for the true understanding of the same, so as ye may be able by them to teach and exhort with wholesome doctrine, and to withstand and convince the gainsayers?

Answer. I will so do, by the help of God.

The Archbishop. Be you ready, with all faithful diligence, to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrine, contrary to God's word, and both privately and openly to call upon and encourage other to the same?

Answer. I am ready, the Lord being my helper.

The Archbishop. Will you deny all ungodliness and worldly lusts, and live soberly, righteously, and godly in this world, that you may shew yourself in all things an example of good works unto other; that the adversary may be ashamed, having nothing to say against you?

Answer. I will so do, the Lord being my helper.

The Archbishop. Will you maintain and set forward (as much as shall lie in you) quietness, peace, and love among all men; and such as be unquiet,

disobedient, and criminous within your Diocese, correct and punish, according to such authority as ye have by God's word, and as to you shall be committed by the ordinance of this realm ?

Answer. I will so do, by the help of God.

The Archbishop. Will you shew yourself gentle, and be merciful for Christ's sake to poor and needy people, and to all strangers destitute of help ?

Answer. I will so shew myself, by God's help.

The Archbishop. Almighty God, our heavenly Father, who hath given you a good will to do all these things ; Grant also unto you strength and power to perform the same, that he accomplishing in you the good work which he hath begun, ye may be found perfect and irreprehensible at the latter day ; through Jesu Christ our Lord. Amen.

*Then shall be sung or said, "Come, Holy Ghost," &c. as it is set out in the Order of Priests.
That ended, the Archbishop shall say,*

Lord, hear our prayer.

Answer. And let our cry come unto thee.

¶ Let us pray.

Almighty God, and most merciful Father, which of thy infinite goodness hast given to us thy only and most dear beloved Son Jesus Christ to be our Redeemer and Author of everlasting life, who, after that he had made perfect our redemption by his death, and was ascended into heaven, poured down his gifts abundantly upon men, making some apostles, some prophets, some evangelists, some pastors and doctors, to the edifying and making perfect of his congregation ; Grant, we beseech thee, to this thy servant such grace, that he may evermore be ready to spread abroad thy gospel and glad tidings of reconcilment to God, and to use the authority given unto him, not to destroy, but to save ; not to hurt, but to help ; so that he, as a wise and a faithful servant, giving to thy family meat in due season, may at the last day be received into joy ; through Jesu Christ our Lord, who with thee and the Holy Ghost, liveth and reigneth one God, world without end. Amen.

¶ *Then the Archbishop and Bishops present shall lay their hands upon the head of the elected Bishop, the Archbishop saying,*

Take the Holy Ghost, and remember that thou stir up the grace of God which is in thee by imposition of hands ; for God hath not given us the spirit of fear, but of power, and love, and of soberness.

¶ *Then the Archbishop shall deliver him the Bible, saying,*

Give heed unto reading, exhortation, and doctrine. Think upon these things contained in this book ; be diligent in them, that the increase coming thereby may be manifest unto all men. Take heed unto thyself, and unto teaching, and be diligent in doing them ; for by doing this thou shalt both

save thyself and them that hear thee. Be to the flock of Christ a shepherd, not a wolf; feed them, devour them not. Hold up the weak, heal the sick, bind together the broken, bring again the outcasts, seek the lost. Be so merciful, that you be not too remiss; so minister discipline, that you forget not mercy; that when the chief Shepherd shall come, ye may receive the immarcessible crown of glory; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

¶ Then the Archbishop shall proceed to the Communion; with whom the new consecrated Bishop with others shall also communicate. And after the last Collect, immediately before the Benediction, shall be said this prayer:

Most merciful Father, we beseech thee to send down upon this thy servant thy heavenly blessing; and so endue him with thy Holy Spirit, that he, preaching thy word, may not only be earnest to reprove, beseech, and rebuke with all patience and doctrine, but also may be to such as believe an wholesome example in word, in conversation, in love, in faith, in chastity and purity, that, faithfully fulfilling his course, at the latter day he may receive the crown of righteousness laid up by the Lord, the righteous Judge, who liveth and reigneth one God with the Father and the Holy Ghost, world without end. Amen.

ARTICLE IV.

ALTERATIONS MADE IN THE RITUAL UNDER CHARLES THE SECOND.

§ 1. *Changes made in the Ordination of Priests.*

1. There was in the first place some alteration made in the order of the prayers. In the former Editions the ceremony begins with the reading of the Epistle and Gospel, and afterwards with the hymn *Veni Creator*; after which follows the presentation by the Archdeacon of the persons to be ordained, together with the notification which the Bishop makes thereof to the people, and the Collect. This order is a little altered in the Ritual reformed in Charles the Second's time. For it begins with the presentation of the Candidates and the notification which the Bishop makes thereof to the people, after which is read a Collect, and afterwards the Epistle and Gospel, which are different from those in the old one.

2. In both, the [Bishop's] exhortation and the questions are the same; after which, in the new reformed Ritual we find the hymn *Veni Creator*, which in the old one was sung after the Gospel. At last comes the prayer which holds the place of the Preface of the Roman Pontifical, and which is followed by the imposition of hands, together with a formula which has been reformed in the new Ritual; for in the old one we read thus: *Receive the Holy Ghost: whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven; and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained. And be thou a faithful Dispenser of the word of God, and of His holy Sacraments; In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.* But in the new Ritual this formula has been reformed as follows: *Receive the Holy Ghost for the Office and Work of a*

Priest in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the Imposition of our hands. Whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven; and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained. And be thou a faithful Dispenser of the word of God, and of His holy Sacraments; In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

3. In the former Editions of King Edward's Ritual it is said, that after the delivery of the Book of the Gospels into the hands of the ordained, the Creed shall be sung, without determining which Creed; but in that which was reformed by Charles II. it is set down that it shall be the Nicene Creed: *When this is done, the Nicene Creed shall be sung or said.* We then find a Collect, with which this Ordination concludes in the former Editions of Edward's Ritual; but in that which was reformed under Charles II. this Collect is followed by another prayer and a benediction, which it will be proper to insert here.

Prayer.—*Prevent us, O Lord, in all our doings, with Thy most gracious favour, and further us with Thy continual help, that in all our works begun, continued, and ended in Thee, we may glorify Thy holy Name, and finally, by Thy mercy, obtain everlasting life; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.*

Benediction.—*The peace of God, which passeth all understanding, keep your hearts and minds in the knowledge and love of God, and of His Son Jesus Christ our Lord: And the blessing of God Almighty, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, be amongst you, and remain with you always. Amen.*

§ II. Changes made in the Ordination of Bishops.

1. In the reformation made under Charles II. still fewer alterations have been made in the ceremony of the Ordination of Bishops, than in that of Priests. The Office begins in the first place with a Collect which is not found in the former Editions, and which for that reason we shall here insert.

Almighty God, who by Thy Son Jesus Christ, didst give to Thy holy Apostles many excellent gifts, and didst charge them to feed Thy flock; Give grace, we beseech Thee, to all Bishops, the Pastors of Thy Church, that they may diligently preach Thy word, and duly administer the godly discipline thereof; and grant to the people that they may obediently follow the same, that all may receive the crown of everlasting glory; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

2. After the reading of the Gospel, the Ritual of Charles II. lays down that the Nicene Creed is to be sung, which was not determined in the former Editions. It is also said that a Sermon shall be preached, and that afterwards the Bishop elect, vested with his Rochet, shall be presented to the Archbishop; whereas in the first Ritual there is no mention made either of Sermon, or of Rochet.

3. In the rest of the ceremony I see only two alterations worthy of notice. The first is, that among the questions put to the Bishop elect, there has been one added which was not used before, namely this: *Will you be*

faithful in ordaining, sending, or laying hands upon others? with the answer, *I will so be, by the help of God.* The second is, that in the reformed Ritual they have thus determined the formula which is annexed to the imposition of hands: *Receive the Holy Ghost for the Office and Work of a Bishop in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the Imposition of our hands; In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen. And remember that thou stir up the grace of God which is given thee by this Imposition of our hands: for God hath not given us the spirit of fear, but of power, and love, and soberness.*

4. The ancient Ritual does not say what is to be the posture of the Bishop over whom these words are to be pronounced; whereas the new one specifies that he is to be upon his knees. The prayer and benediction which the reformed Ritual has added in the ceremony of the Ordination of Priests, after the Collect which in the old one concludes the office, have also been added after a similar Collect in the ceremony of the Ordination of Bishops. And this is the exact amount of all the alterations which the revisers made in the new Ritual of the time of Charles II. It is easy to judge by this alone, whether there is the least probability that these alterations can contribute in any respect to the validity or invalidity of an Ordination.

ARTICLE V.

GENERAL AUTHORITY GIVEN BY POPE JULIUS THE THIRD TO CARDINAL POLE FOR RECONCILING ENGLAND TO THE CHURCH OF ROME.^a

JULIUS PP. III.

Dilecte fili noster, Salutem et Apostolicam Benedictionem. Dudùm eùm charissima in Christo filia nostra Maria, Angliæ tunc princeps, regina declarata fuisset, et speraretur regnum Angliæ, quod sævâ regum tyrannide ab unione sanctæ ecclesiæ catholicæ separatum fuerat, ad ovile gregis Domini, et ejusdem ecclesiæ unionem, ipsâ Mariâ primùm regnante, redire posse: Nos te præstanti virtute, singulari pietate, ac multâ doctrinâ insignem, ad eandem Mariam reginam, et universum Angliæ regnum, de fratrum nostrorum consilio et unanimi consensu, nostrum et apostolicæ sedis legatum de latere destinavimus; tibi que inter cætera, omnes et singulos utriusque sexûs, tam laïcas quam ecclesiasticas, sæculares, et quorumvis ordinum regulares personas, in quibusvis etiam sacris ordinibus constitutas, cujuscumque statûs, gradûs, conditionis et qualitatis exstiterint, ac quacumque ecclesiastica etiam episcopali, archiepiscopali, et patriarchali, aut mundana, etiam marchionali, ducali, aut regia dignitate præfulgerent, etiam capitulum, collegium, universitas, seu communitas forent, quarumcumque hæresium aut novarum sectarum professores, aut in eis culpabiles vel suspectas ac credentes, receptatores et fautores eorum, etiamsi relapsæ

^a This document is taken from the French translation of Burnet's History, printed at Amsterdam in 12mo. in 1687. vol. 4, p. 1068. [Comp. p. 232, note h.]

fuissent, eorum errorem cognoscentes et de illis dolentes, ac ad orthodoxam fidem recipi humiliter postulantes, cognitâ in eis verâ et non fictâ aut simulatâ pœnitentiâ in omnibus et singulis per eos perpetratis (hæreses et ab eadem fide apostasias, blasphemias, et alios quoscumque errores etiam sub generali sermone non venientes sapientibus) peccatis, criminibus, excessibus et delictis, necnon excommunicationum, suspensionum, interdictorum, et aliis ecclesiasticis ac temporalibus, etiam corporis afflictivis, et capitalibus sententiis, censuris et pœnis in eos, præmissorum occasione, à jure vel ab homine latis vel promulgatis, etiamsi in iis viginti et plus annis insorduissent, et eorum absolutio nobis et divinæ sedi, et per literas in die cœnæ Domini legi consuetas reservata existeret, in utroque conscientiæ videlicet et contentioso foro, plenariè absolvendi et liberandi, ac aliorum Christi-fidelium consortio aggregandi: necnon cum eis super irregularitate per eos præmissorum occasione, etiam quia sic ligati missas et alia divina officia, etiam contra ritus et cœremonias ab ecclesia eatenùs probatas et usitatas celebrassent, aut illis aliàs se miscuissent, contracta; necnon bigama per eosdem ecclesiasticos, sæculares vel regulares, verè aut fictè, seu aliàs qualitercumque inversa (etiamsi ex eo quòd clerici in sacris constituti, cum viduis vel aliis corruptis matrimonium contraxisse prætenderetur), rejectis et expulsis tamen priùs uxoribus sic de facto copulatis: quodque bigamiâ et irregularitate, ac aliis præmissis non obstantibus, in eorum ordinibus, dummodò ante eorum lapsum in hæresim hujusmodi ritè et legitimè promoti vel ordinati fuissent, etiam in altaris ministerio ministrare, ac quæcunque et qualitercunque etiam curata beneficia secularia vel regularia, ut priùs, dummodò super eis alteri jus quæsitum non existeret, retinere; et non promoti ad omnes etiam sacros et presbyteratûs ordines, ab eorum ordinariis, si digni et idonei reperti fuissent, promoveri, ac beneficia ecclesiastica, si iis alias canonicè conferrentur, recipere et retinere valerent, dispensandi et indulgendi; ac omnem infamiæ et inhabilitatis maculam sive notam, ex præmissis quomodolibet insurgentem, penitùs et omninò abolendi; necnon ad pristinos honores, dignitates, famam, et patriam, et bona etiam confiscata, in pristinumque, et eum in quo ante præmissa quomodolibet erant, statum restituendi, reponendi, et reintegrandi; ac eis, dummodò corde contriti eorum errata et excessus alicui per eos eligendo catholico confessori sacramentaliter confiterentur, ac pœnitentiam salutarem, eis per ipsum confessorem propterea injungendam omninò adimplerent, omnem publicam confessionem abjurationem, renunciationem, et pœnitentiam jure debitam arbitrio tuo moderandi, vel in totum remittendi. Necnon communitates et universitates, ac singulares personas quascumque à quibusvis illicitis pactionibus et conventionibus per eos cum dominis aberrantibus, seu in eorum favorem quomodolibet initis, et iis præstitis juramentis et homagiis, illorumque omnium observatione, et si quem eatenùs occasione eorum incurrissent perjurii reatum, etiam absolventi, et juramenta ipsa relaxandi. Ac quoscumque regulares et religiosos,

etiam in hæresim hujusmodi, ut præfertur, lapsos, extra eorum regularia loca absque dictæ sedis licentia vagantes, ab apostasiæ reatu et excommunicationis, aliisque censuris ac pœnis ecclesiasticis, per eos propterea etiam juxta suorum ordinum instituta incursis, pariter absolvendi: ac cum eis ut alicui beneficio ecclesiastico curato de illud obtinentis consensu, etiam in habitu clerici sæcularis, habitum suum regularem sub honesta toga presbyteri sæcularis deferendo, deservire, et extra eadem regularia loca remanere liberè et licitè possint, dispensandi. Necnon quibusvis personis, etiam ecclesiasticis, ut quadragesimalibus et aliis anni temporibus et diebus, quibus usus ovorum et carniū est de jure prohibitus, butyro, et caseo, et aliis lacticiniis, ac dictis ovis et carniibus, de utriusque seu alterius, spiritualis, qui catholicus existeret, medici consilio, aut si locorum et personarum qualitate inspectâ ex defectu piscium, aut olei, vel indispositione personarum earundem, seu aliâ causâ legitimâ, id tibi faciendum videretur, ut tuo arbitrio uti et vesci possint, indulgendi et concedendi. Necnon per te in præteritis duntaxat casibus, aliquos clericos sæculares, tantùm presbyteros, diaconos, aut subdiaconos, qui matrimonium cum aliquibus virginibus, vel corruptis sæcularibus etiam mulieribus de facto eatenus contraxissent, consideratâ aliquâ ipsorum singulari qualitate, et cognitâ eorum verâ ad Christi fidem conversione, ac aliis circumstantiis ac modificationibus tuo tantùm arbitrio adhibendis, ex quibus aliis præsertim clericis in sacris ordinibus hujusmodi constitutis, quibus non licet uxores habere, scandalum omninò non generetur, citra tamen altaris, ac alia sacerdotum ministeria, et titulos beneficiorum ecclesiasticorum, ac omni ipsorum ordinum exercitio sublato, ab excommunicationis sententiâ, et aliis reatibus propterea incursis, injunctâ inde eis etiam tuo arbitrio pœnitentiâ salutari, absolvendi, ac cum eis, dummodò alter eorum superstes remaneret, de cætero sine spe conjugii, quod inter se matrimonium legitimè contrahere, et in eo, postquam contractum foret, licitè remanere possent, prolem exinde legitimam decernendo, misericorditer dispensandi: ac quæcumque beneficia ecclesiastica, tam sæcularia quàm regularia, et quæ per rectores catholicos possidebantur, de ipsorum tamen rectorum catholicorum consensu, seu absque eorum præjudicio, cuicumque alteri beneficio ecclesiastico ob ejus fructus tenuitatem, aut hospitali jam erecto vel erigendo, seu studio universali, vel scholis literariis, uniendi, annectendi, et incorporandi, aut fructus, redditus, et proventus, seu bonorum beneficiorum dividendi, separandi et dismembrandi, ac eorum sic divisorum, separatorum, et dismembratorum partem aliis beneficiis seu hospitalibus, vel studiis aut scholis, seu piis usibus similiter arbitrio tuo perpetuò applicandi et appropriandi. Ac cum possessoribus bonorum ecclesiasticorum (restitutis prius, si tibi expedire videretur, immobilibus per eos indebitè detentis) super fructibus malè perceptis, ac bonis mobilibus consumptis, concordandi, et transigendi, ac eos desuper liberandi et quietandi: ac quidquid ex concordiis et transactionibus hujusmodi proveniret, in ecclesiæ cujus essent bona, vel in studiorum univer-

salium, aut scholarum hujusmodi, seu alios pios usus convertendi, omniaque et singula alia, in quæ in præmissis et circa ea quomodolibet necessaria et opportuna esse cognosceres, faciendi, dicendi, gerendi et exercendi: necnon catholicos locorum ordinarios, aut alias personas Deum timentes, fide insignes, et literarum scientiâ præditas, ac gravitate morum conspicuas, et ætate venerandâ, de quarum probitate et circumspectione, ac charitatis zelo plena fiducia conspici posset, ad præmissa omnia, cum simili vel limitata potestate (absolutione et dispensatione clericorum circa connubia, ac unione beneficiorum, seu eorum fructuum et bonorum separatione, et applicatione, ac concordia cum possessoribus bonorum ecclesiasticorum et eorum liberatorum, duntaxat exceptis) substituendi et subdelegandi: ac diversas alias facultates per diversas alias nostras tam sub plumbo quam in forma brevis confectas literas, concessimus, prout in illis plenius continetur. Verùm cum tu ad partes Flandriæ, ex quibus brevissima ad regnum transfretatio existit, te contuleris, ac ex certis rationalibus nobis notis causis inibi aliquandiu subsistere habeas, ac à nonnullis nimum forsitan scrupulosis, hæsitetur, an tu in partibus hujusmodi subsistens, prædictis ac aliis tibi concessis facultatibus uti, ac in eodem regno locorum ordinarios, aut alias personas, ut præmittitur, qualificatas, quæ facultatibus per te juxta dictarum literarum continentiam pro tempore concessis utantur, alias juxta earumdem literarum prædictarum tenorem substituere, et delegare possis: Nos causam tuæ subsistentiæ in eisdem partibus approbantes, et singularum literarum prædictarum tenores, præsentibus pro sufficienter expressis, ac de verbo ad verbum insertis, habentes, circumspectioni tuæ quòd quandiu in eisdem partibus de licentia nostra moram traxeris, legatione tua prædicta durante, etiam extra ipsum regnum existens, omnibus et singulis prædictis, et quibusvis aliis tibi concessis, et quæ per præsentibus tibi conceduntur, facultatibus, etiam erga quoscunque archiepiscopos, episcopos, ac abbates, aliosque ecclesiarum tam sæcularium quàm quorumvis ordinum regularium, necnon monasteriorum et aliorum locorum regularium prælatos, non secùs ac erga alios inferiores clericos, uti possis, necnon erga alias personas in singulis literis prædictis quovis modo nominatas, ad te pro tempore recurrentes vel mittentes, etiam circa ordines quos nunquam aut malè susceperunt, et munus consecrationis quod iis ab aliis episcopis vel archiepiscopis etiam hæreticis et schismaticis, aut aliàs minùs ritè et non servatâ formâ ecclesiæ consuetâ impensum fuit, etiam si ordines et munus hujusmodi etiam circa altaris ministerium temerè executi sint, per te ipsum vel alios, ad id à te pro tempore deputatos, liberè uti, ac in eodem regno tot quot tibi videbuntur locorum ordinarios, vel alias personas, ut præmittitur, qualificatas, quæ facultatibus per te, eis pro tempore concessis (citra tamen eas quæ solùm tibi, ut præfertur, concessæ existunt) etiam te in partibus Flandriæ hujusmodi subsistente, liberè utantur, et eas exerceant et exequantur aliàs, juxta ipsarum literarum continentiam ac tenorem substituere et subdelegare. Necnon de

personis quorumcunque episcoporum vel archiepiscoporum, qui metropolitana nam aut alias cathedrales ecclesias de manu laïcorum etiam schismaticorum, et præsertim qui de Henrici regis et Eduardi ejus nati receperunt, et eorum regimini et administrationi se ingesserunt, et eorum fructus, redditus et proventus etiam longissimo tempore, tanquam veri archiepiscopi aut episcopi temerè et de facto usurpando, etiamsi in hæresim, ut præfertur, inciderint, seu antea hæretici fuerint; postquam per te unitati sanctæ matris ecclesiæ restituti exstiterint, tuque eos rehabilitandos esse censueris, si tibi aliàs digni et idonei videbuntur, eisdem metropolitanis et aliis cathedralibus ecclesiis denuò, necnon quibusvis aliis cathedralibus etiam metropolitanis ecclesiis per obitum vel privationem illarum præsulum, seu aliàs quovis modo pro tempore vacantibus, de personis idoneis pro quibus ipsa Maria regina juxta consuetudines ipsius regni tibi supplicaverit autoritate nostra providere, ipsasque personas eisdem ecclesiis in episcopos aut archiepiscopos præficere: Ac cum iis qui ecclesias cathedrales et metropolitanas de manu laïcorum, etiam schismaticorum, ut præfertur, receperunt, quod eisdem seu aliis, ad quas eas aliàs ritè transferri contigerit, cathedralibus etiam metropolitanis ecclesiis, in episcopos vel archiepiscopos præesse, ipsasque ecclesias in spiritualibus et temporalibus regere et gubernare, ac munere consecrationis eis hactenùs impenso uti, vel si illud eis nondum impensum exstiterit, ab episcopis vel archiepiscopis catholicis per te nominandis suscipere liberè et licitè possint. Necnon cum quibusvis per te, ut præmittitur, pro tempore absolutis et rehabilitatis, ut eorum erroribus et excessibus præteritis non obstantibus, quibusvis cathedralibus, etiam metropolitanis ecclesiis in episcopos et archiepiscopos præfici et præesse, illasque in eisdem spiritualibus et temporalibus regere et gubernare; ac ad quoscunque etiam sacros et presbyteratûs ordines promovere, et in illis aut per eos jam licèt minùs ritè susceptis ordinibus etiam in altaris ministerio ministrare, necnon munus consecrationis suscipere, et illo uti liberè et licitè valeant, dispensare etiam liberè et licitè possis, plenam et liberam apostolicam autoritatem per præsententes concedimus facultatem et potestatem: non obstantibus constitutionibus et ordinationibus apostolicis, ac omnibus illis, quæ in singulis literis præteritis volumus non obstare, cæterisque contrariis quibuscunque.

Datum Romæ apud S. Petrum sub annulo piscatoris die 8 Martii 1554, pontificatûs nostri anno quinto.

The words of this Bull are distinct. The prelates ordained under Edward, are not distinguished there from those ordained under Henry. But the validity of the Ordination of these latter was not disputed. The only business was to reinstate them. As yet then it was not believed at Rome that Edward's Ritual had affected the essentials of Ordination; nor do the degradations performed under Mary prove it any more, since the same conduct was observed with regard to the Bishops and Priests ordained under Henry.

ARTICLE VI.

A COLLECTION OF RECORDS RELATING TO PARKER.

Cardinal Pole having died in 1558, the Archbishopric of Canterbury continued vacant until the eighteenth of July 1559, when at the request of the Chapter, Elizabeth granted her Congé d'élire^a. After the usual formalities, the election was made the first of August, and Matthew Parker having been elected, accepted this election the sixth of the same month. Bramhall has published the formal series of all these papers, but as they are not necessary for us, we have satisfied ourselves with transcribing the following, taken from the Register of Canterbury, or from Rymer's Collection.

§ I. *Elizabeth's first Letters Patent, for the Confirmation and Consecration of Parker.*

^b Elizabetha, Dei gratiâ Angliæ, &c. Reverendis in Christo Patribus, Cuthberto episcopo Dunelmensi, Gilberto Bathoniensi episcopo, David episcopo Burgi Sancti Petri, Antonio Landavensi episcopo, Willielmo Barlo episcopo, et Johanni Scory episcopo, Salutem.

Cùm vacante nuper sede archiepiscopali Cantuariensi per mortem naturalem Domini Reginaldi Pole Cardinalis, ultimi et immediati archiepiscopi et pastoris ejusdem, ad humilem petitionem decani et capituli ecclesiæ nostræ cathedralis et metropoliticæ Christi Cantuariensis, eisdem per literas nostras patentes, licentiam concessimus alium sibi eligendi in archiepiscopum et pastorem sedis prædictæ, ac iidem decanus et capitulum vigore et obtentu licentiæ nostræ prædictæ, dilectum nobis in Christo Magistrum Mathæum Parker Sacræ Theologiæ Professore sibi et ecclesiæ prædictæ ^c elegerint in archiepiscopum et pastorem, prout per literas suas patentes sigillo eorum communi sigillatas, nobis inde directas, pleniùs liquet et apparet;

Nos, electionem illam acceptantes, eidem electioni regium nostrum assensum adhibuimus pariter et favorem, et hoc vobis tenore præsentium significamus;

Rogantes, ac in fide et dilectione quibus nobis tenemini, firmiter præcipiendo mandantes, quatenùs eundem Mag. Math. Parker in archiepiscopum et pastorem ecclesiæ cathedralis et metropoliticæ Christi Cantuariensis prædictæ, sic, ut præfertur, electum, electionemque prædictam confirmare, et eundem Mag. Mathæum in archiepiscopum et pastorem ecclesiæ prædictæ consecrare, cæteraque omnia et singula peragere, quæ vestro in hac parte incumbunt officio pastorali, juxta formam statutorum in ea parte editorum et provisorum, velitis cum effectu. In cujus rei testimonium, &c. Teste Reginâ apud Redgrave, nono die Septembris. Per breve de privato sigillo.

^a Rymer, vol. 15. p. 536. ^b Rymer, vol. 15. p. 541. [^c In Rymer *eligerint.*]

II. *Queen Elizabeth's second Letters Patent, for proceeding to the Confirmation and Consecration of Parker.*

As the first Letters Patent were without effect, the Queen granted others the sixth of December following, in which she added a clause, beginning with these words, *Supplentes nihilominus, &c.*, from which has been drawn an objection against the validity of the English Ordinations; but the most learned Canonists of England have found no difficulty in it: for here is the judgment they pass upon it.

^d We whose names be here under subscribed, think in our judgments, that by this commission in the form penned, as well the Queen's Majesty may lawfully authorize the persons within named to the effect specified, as the said persons may exercise the act of confirming and consecrating in the same to them committed.

William May,	Henry Harvey,
Robert Weston,	Thomas Yale,
Edward Leeds,	Nicholas Bullingham.

^e Regina, &c. Reverendis in Christo Patribus, Anthonio Landavensi episcopo, Willielmo Barlowe quondam Bathon. episcopo, nunc Cicestrensi electo, Johanni Scorye quondam^f Cicestrensi episcopo, nunc Herefordensi, Miloni Coverdall quondam Exoniensi episcopo, Ricardo Bedfordensi, Johanni Thetfordensi, episcopis suffraganeis, Johanni Bale Osserensi episcopo, Salutem.

Cùm, vacante nuper sede archiepiscopali Cantuariensi per mortem naturalem D. Reginaldi Pole Cardinalis, ultimi et immediati archiepiscopi et pastoris ejusdem, ad humilem petitionem decani et capituli ecclesiæ nostræ cathedralis et metropoliticæ Christi Cantuariensis, eisdem per literas nostras patentes licentiam concessimus alium sibi eligendi in archiepiscopum et pastorem sedis prædictæ, ac iidem decanus et capitulum vigore et obtentu licentiæ nostræ prædictæ, dilectum nobis in Christo Mag. Mathæum Parker S. Theologiæ Professorem, sibi et ecclesiæ prædictæ elegerint in archiepiscopum et pastorem, prout per literas suas patentes, sigillo eorum communi sigillatas, nobis inde directas, plenius liquet et apparet;

Nos, electionem illam acceptantes, eidem electioni regium nostrum assensum adhibuimus pariter et favorem; et hoc vobis tenore præsentium significamus;

Rogantes, ac in fide et dilectione, quibus nobis tenemini, firmiter præcipiendo mandantes, quatenus vos aut ad minus quatuor vestrum, eundem Math. Parker in archiepiscopum et pastorem ecclesiæ cathedralis et metropoliticæ Christi Cantuariensis prædictæ, sic, ut præfertur, electum, electio-

^d The Life of Parker, p. 55. and Bramhall, p. 1026. [In Bramhall's Works, *We here subscribed,—in this form penned,*

aswell &c.]

^e Rymer, vol. 15. p. 549.

^f [In Rymer *Cicestriensi.*]

nemque prædictam confirmare, et eundem Mag. Math. Parker in archiepiscopum et pastorem ecclesiæ prædictæ consecrare, cæteraque omnia et singula peragere, quæ vestro in hac parte incumbunt officio pastorali, juxta formam statutorum in ea parte editorum et provisorum, velitis cum effectu ;

¶ Supplentes nichilominùs, supremâ auctoritate nostrâ regiâ, ex mero motu ac certâ scientiâ nostris, si quid aut in hiis quæ juxta mandatum nostrum prædictum per vos fient, aut in vobis, aut vestrûm aliquo, conditione, statu, facultate vestris ad præmissa perficienda desit aut deerit eorum quæ per statuta hujus regni, aut per leges ecclesiasticas, in hac parte requiruntur aut necessaria sunt, temporis ratione et rerum necessitate id postulante. In cujus rei &c. Teste Regina apud Westmonasterium vi. die Decembris.

§ III. *Confirmation of the Election of Parker by the consecrating Bishops*^h.

ⁱIn Dei nomine, Amen. Nos Willielmus quondam Bathon. et Wellen. episcopus, nunc electus Cicestren., Johannes Scory quondam Cicestren. episcopus, nunc Hereforden. electus, Milo Coverdale quondam Exon. episcopus, et Johannes Bedforden. episcopus, Serenissimæ in Christo Principis et Dominæ nostræ Dominæ Elizabethæ Dei gratiâ Angliæ, Franciæ et Hiberniæ Reginæ, fidei defens. &c., mediantibus literis suis regiis commissionalibus patentibus ad infra scripta Commissarii, cum hac clausula, (videlicet) unâ cum Dominis Johanne Thetforden. suffraganeo, et Johanne Bale Osseren. episcopo, et etiam hac clausula, quatenùs vos aut ad minus quatuor vestrûm &c. necnon et hac adjectione, supplentes nihilominus &c. specialiter et legitimè deputati in negotio confirmationis electionis de persona venerabilis et eximii viri Mag. Matthæi Parker, Sacræ Theologiæ Professoris, in archiepiscopum Cantuariensem electi, factæ et celebratæ ritè et legitimè procedentes, omnes et singulos oppositores qui contra dictam electionem seu formam ejusdem, aut personam electam dicere, excipere, vel opponere voluerint, ad comparandum coram nobis istis die, horis, et loco, (si sua putaverint interesse), contra dictam electionem, formam ejusdem, aut personam electam in debita juris forma dicturos, excepturos, et proposituros, legitimè et peremptoriè citatos, sæpiùs publice præconizatos, diuque et sufficienter expectatos, et nullo modo comparentes, nec contra dictam electionem, formam ejusdem, aut personam electam, aliquid dicentes, excipientes, vel opposentes, ad petitionem procuratoris decani et capituli Cantuarien. pronunciamus contumaces, et in pœnam contumaciarum suarum hujusmodi decernimus procedendum fore ad prolationem sententiæ sive decreti finalis in

^h It is to this clause that the preceding judgment applies.

ⁱ Parker was confirmed by Proxy. He named his Proxies Dec. 7: they were Nic.

Bullingham and Will. May Dean of St. Paul's in London.

¹ Bramhall, Works, p. 1042.

hac causa ferendi, ipsorum sic citatorum et non comparentium contumacia in aliquo non obstante.^k

In Dei nomine Amen. Auditis, visis, et intellectis, ac plenariè et maturè discussis per nos Will. quondam Bathon. et Wellen. episcopum nunc Cices-trensem electum, Joh. Scorye quondam Cicestr. episcopum, nunc electum Hereford. Milonem Coverdale quondam Exon. episcopum, et Johan. Bedford. episcopum, Serenissimæ in Christo Principis et Dom. nostræ D. Elizabethæ Dei gratiâ Angliæ, Franciæ, et Hiberniæ Reginæ, fidei defens. &c. medi-antibus literis suis regiis commissionalibus patentibus ad infra scripta Com-missarios, cum hac clausula, (videlicet) unà cum Dominis Joh. Thetfordensi suffraganeo, et Joh. Bale Osserensi episcopo, et etiam hac clausula, quatenus vos, aut ad minus quatuor vestrûm &c. necnon et hac adjectione (Sup-plementes nihilominus, &c.) specialiter et legitimè deputatos, meritis et circum-stantiis cujusdam causæ sive negotii confirmationis electionis de persona venerabilis et eximii viri Mag. Matt. Parker, S. Theologiæ Professoris, in archiep. et pastorem ecclesiæ cathedralis et metropoliticæ Christi Cantuariensis, per obitum bonæ memoriæ D. Reginaldi Pole, ultimi archiepiscopi ibidem, vacantis, electi, factæ et celebratæ, quod coram nobis aliquandiu vertebatur, et in præsentì vertitur et pendet indeciss. rimato primitus per nos toto et integro processu coram nobis in dicto negotio habito et facto, atque diligenter recensito, servatisque per nos de jure et statutis hujus regni servandis, ad nostri decreti finalis sive sententiæ diffinitivæ confirmationis in hujusmodi negotio ferendæ prolationem sic duximus procedendum, et pro-cedimus in hunc qui sequitur modum: Quia per acta exhibita, producta et probata coram nobis in hujusmodi confirmationis negotio, comperimus, et luculenter invenimus electionem ipsam per decanum et capitulum ecclesiæ cathedralis et metropoliticæ Christi Cantuar. prædictæ de præfato ven. et eximio viro Mag. Matt. Parker electo hujusmodi, viro utique provide et discreto, vitâ et moribus meritò commendato, libero et de legitimo matrimonio procreato, atque in ætate legitima et ordine sacerdotali constituto, ritè et legiti-mè fuisse et esse factam et celebratam, nihilque eidem ven. viro Mag. Matt. Parker electo hujusmodi, de ecclesiasticis institutis obviasse seu obviare quo minùs in archiep. Cantuar. autoritate dictæ Illustrissimæ Domine nostræ Reginæ meritò debeat confirmari; Idcirco nos Will. nuper Bathon. et Wellen. episcopus, nunc Cicestrensis electus, Johannes Scory quondam Cicestrensis episcopus, nunc electus Herefordensis, Milo Coverdale quondam Exon. episc. et Johannes Bedfordensis episcopus, Commissarii regii antedicti, attentis præmissis, et aliis virtut' merit', super quibus præfatus electus Cantuariensis fide digno commendatur testimonio, Christi nomine primitus invocato, ac ipsum solum Deum oculis nostris præponendo, de et cum consilio jurisperi-torum, cum quibus in hac parte communicavimus prædictum electionem de eodem ven. viro Mag. Matt. Parker (ut præfertur) factam et celebratam,

^k Here is given the Oath of Supremacy taken by Parker.

suprema autoritate dictæ Ser. D. N. Reginae nobis in hac parte commissa confirmamus; suppletentes ex suprema autoritate regia, ex mero principis motu, ac certa scientia nobis delegata, quidquid in hac electione fuerit defectum, tum in hiis quæ juxta mandatum nobis creditum a nobis factum et processum est, aut in nobis, aut aliquorum nostrorum conditione, statu, facultate ad hæc perficienda deest aut deerit; tum etiam eorum quæ per statuta hujus regni Angliæ, aut per leges ecclesiasticas, in hac parte requisita sunt vel necessaria, prout temporis ratio et rerum præsentium necessitas id postulant, per hanc nostram sententiam diffinitivam, sive hoc nostrum finale decretum, quam sive quod ad petitionem partium ita petentium fecimus, et promulgamus in hiis scriptis.

§ IV. *Record of Parker's Consecration taken from the Registers of the Church of Canterbury*^l, and from *Corpus Christi College Library at Cambridge*.^m [N.B. The readings of the Cambridge copy are given in the text, the variations of that of Canterbury in the notes.—ED.]

ⁿ Rituum atque cæremoniarum ordo in consecrando Reverendissimo in Christo Patre, Matth. Parker, Cantuariensi Archiepiscopo in Sacello suo apud Manerium suum de Lambeth, die Dominico, xvii. viz. die mensis Decembris, Anno Dom. 1559, habit'.

Principio, sacellum tapetibus ad orientem adornabatur, solum verò panno rubro insternebatur; mensa quoque sacris peragendis necessaria, tapeto pulvinarique ornata ad orientem sita erat.

Quatuor præterea cathedræ, quatuor episcopis quibus munus consecrandi archiepiscopi delegabatur, ad austrum orientalis sacelli partis erant positæ.

Scamnum præterea tapeto pulvinaribusque instratum, cui episcopi genibus flexis inniterentur, ante cathedras ponebatur.

Pari quoque modo cathedra, scamnumque tapeto pulvinarique ornatum, archiepiscopo, ad borealem orientalis ejusdem sacelli partis plagam posita erant.

Hiis rebus ita ordine suo instructis, mane circiter quintam aut sextam per occidentalem portam ingreditur sacellum archiepiscopus, togâ talari coccineâ caputioque indutus, quatuor præcedentibus funalibus, et quatuor comitatus episcopis, qui ejus consecrationi inservirent (verbi gratiâ)^o Guilielmo Barlow olim Bathon. et Wellen. episcopo,^p nunc verò ad Cicestren. episcopatum electo, Joh. Scory olim Cicestr. episcopo et^q nunc ad Herefordensem vocato, Milone^r Coverdallo olim Exoniense episcopo, et Joh. ^s Hodgskinne Bedfordiæ suffraganeo. Qui omnes postquam sedes sibi paratas ordine singuli suo occupassent, Preces continuò matutinæ per Andream Pierson archiepiscopi capellanum clara voce recitabantur; quibus peractis, Joh. Scory (de quo supra diximus)

[^l Bramhall's Works, p. 1044.]

^m Bramhall, p. 1051. Burnet, vol. 2. Collect. of Records, p. 363. [B. 3. No. 9.]

[ⁿ The title is worded rather differently in the Canterbury copy: see the Editor's notes.]

[^o Exemplar Cantuariense, *Willielmo Barloe quondam.*]

[^p Ex. Cant. *nunc electo Cicestren.*]

[^q Cant. *nunc Hereforden. electo.*]

[^r Ex. Cant. *Coverdale quondam.*]

^s In Cant. deest *Hodgskinne.*

suggestum conscendit, atque inde assumpto sibi in thema, *Seniores ergo qui in vobis sunt obsecro consenior*, &c. non ineleganter concionabatur.

Finita concione, egrediuntur simul archiepiscopus reliquique quatuor episcopi sacellum, se ad sacram communionem paraturi; neque mora, confestim per borealem portam ^t in vestiarium, ad hunc modum vestiti redeunt. Archiepiscopus nimirum linteo superpelliceo (quod vocant) induebatur. Cicestrensis electus capâ sericâ ad sacra peragenda paratus utebatur. Cui ministrabant operamque suam præbebant duo archiepiscopi capellani,^u Nicholaus viz. Bullingham Lincolnæ ^x archidiaconus, et Edmundus Gest Cantuariensis ^y quoque archidiaconus, capis sericis similiter vestiti. Hereford. electus, et Bedfordiensis suffraganeus linteis superpelliceis induebantur.

Milo verò Coverdallus non nisi togâ lanæ talari utebatur.

Atque hunc in modum vestiti et instructi ad communionem celebrandam perrexerunt, archiepiscopo genibus flexis ad infimum sacelli gradum sedente.

Finito tandem evangelio, Hereford. electus, Bedfordiæ suffraganeus, et Milo ^z Coverdallus (de quibus supra) archiepiscopum coram Cicestrensi electo apud mensam in cathedra ^a sedenti, hiis verbis adduxerunt: Rev. in Deo Pater, hunc virum pium pariter atque doctum tibi offerimus atque præsentamus, ut archiepiscopus consecretur. Postque hæc ^b dixissent, proferebatur illicò ^c reginæ diploma sive mandatum pro consecratione archiepiscopi, quo per ^dRev. Thomam Yale legum doctorem perlecto, sacramentum de regio primatu sive suprema ejus autoritate tuenda juxta statuta primo anno regni Serenissimæ Reginæ nostræ Elizabethæ ^e promulgata ab eodem archiepiscopo exigebatur, quod cum ille solemniter tactis corporaliter sacris evangelii conceptis verbis præstitisset, Cicestrensis electus ^f quædam præfatus, atque populum ad orationem hortatus, ad litanias decantandas choro respondente se accinxit. Quibus finitis, post quæstiones aliquot archiepiscopo per Cicestr. electum propositas, et post orationes et suffragia quædam juxta formam libri ^g antedicti parlamenti editi apud Deum habita,^h Cicestriensis, Herefordiensis, suffraganeus Bedfordiensis, et Milo Coverdallus, manibus archiepiscopo impositis, ⁱ Accipe (inquiunt Anglicè) Spiritum Sanctum, et gratiam Dei quæ jam per ^k impositionem manuum in te est excitare memento. Non enim timoris, sed virtutis, dilectionis, et sobrietatis spiritum dedit nobis Deus. ^l His ita dictis, biblia sacra illi in manibus tradiderunt, hujusmodi apud eum verba habentes: ^m In legendo, hortando, et docendo

^t Fortè ingressi in vestiarium. In exempl. ecel. Cant. deest in vestiarium.

[^u Ex. Cant. (viz.) Nicholaus.]

^x In ex. Cant. deest archidiaconus.

^y Cant. respectivè archidiaconi.

[^z Ex. Cant. Coverdale.]

^a Ex. Cant. sedente.

^b Cant. dixisset.

[^c Ex. Cant. Regium.]

[^d Ex. Cant. per D. Thomam.]

^e Cant. edita et prom.

^f In Cant. desunt hæc verba quædam præfatus atque.

^g Meliùs Cant. autoritate Parl.

[^h Ex. Cant. Cicestren., Hereforden., and Bedforden.]

ⁱ In ex. Cant. hæc formula Anglicè legitur. [dixerunt Anglicè (videlicet) Take &c.]

^k Male leg. impositionis.

[^l Ex. Cant. Hiis dictis.]

^m In ex. Cant. hæc formula Anglicè legitur.

vide diligens sis, atque ea meditare assiduè quæ in hisce libris scripta sunt : noli in his segnibus esse, quo incrementum inde proveniens omnibus innotescat et palàm fiat. Cura quæ ad te et ad docendi munus spectant diligenter. Hoc enim modo non teipsum solum, sed et reliquos auditores tuos per Jesum Christum Dom. nostrum salvabis. Postquam hæc dixissent, ad reliqua communionis solennia pergunt Cicestrensis, nullum archiepiscopo tradens pastorale baculum : cum quo communicabant ⁿ unà archiepiscopus, et illi episcopi supra nominati, cum aliis etiam nonnullis.

Finitis tandem peractisque sacris, egreditur per borealem ^o orientis sacelli partis portam archiepiscopus, quatuor illis comitatus episcopis qui eum consecraverant, et confestim iisdem ipsis stipatus episcopis per eandem revertitur portam, albo episcopali superpelliceo, crimeraque (ut vocant) ex nigro serico indutus, circa collum verò collare quoddam ex pretiosis pellibus sabellinis (vulgo *Sables* vocant) consutum gestabat. Pari quoque modo Cicestrensis et Hereford. suis episcopalibus amictibus, superpelliceo ^p scilicet et crimera uterque induebatur. D. Coverdallus verò et Bedfordiæ suffraganeus togis solummodò talaribus utebantur. Pergens deinde occidentalem portam versus archiepiscopus, Thomæ Doyle ^q œconomo, Johanni Baker thesaurario, et Johan. Marche computo rotulario, singulis singulos albos dedit baculos ; hoc scilicet modo ^r eis muneribus et officiis suis ornans.

Hiis itaque hunc ad modum ordine suo ut jam ante dictum est peractis, per occidentalem portam sacellum egreditur archiepiscopus, generosioribus quibusque sanguine ^s ex ejus familia eum præcedentibus, reliquis verò eum à tergo sequentibus.

Acta gesta que hæc erant omnia in præsentia Reverendorum ^t episcoporum Edmundi Gryndall ^u Londinensis episcopi electi, Richardi Cockes Eliensis electi, Edwini Sandes Wigorn. electi, Anthonii Huse armigeri, principalis et primarii registrarii dicti ^x archiepiscopi, Thomæ Argall armigeri registrarii ^y Cicestriæ prærogativæ Cantuariensis, Thomæ Willet et Joh. Incent notariorum publicorum, et aliorum ^z quoque nonnullorum.

After this Record we find several certificates. The following is that of the Notary :

Concordat cum originali in bibliotheca Collegii Corporis Christi apud Cantabrigienses.

Ita testor Matth. Whinn Notarius Public. et
Acad. Cant. Registrarius Principalis.

Another Certificate.

Camb. Jan. 11. 1674.

We whose names are hereunto subscribed, having seen the original,

ⁿ In Cant. deest unà.

^o Melius Cant. *orientalis*.

^p In Cant. deest *scilicet*.

[^q Ex. Cant. *Iconimo*.]

^r Melius Cant. *eos*.

^s Cant. *et*.

^t Cant. *in Christo Patrum*. Deest *episcoporum*.

[^u Ex. Cant. *London*.]

[^x So Cant. : Camb. *Archiepiscopali*.]

^y Melius Cant. *Curia*.

^z In Cant. deest *quoque*.

whereof this writing is a perfect copy, and considered the hand and other circumstances thereof, are fully persuaded that it is a true and genuine record of the Rites and Ceremonies of Archbishop Parker's Consecration, and as ancient as the date it ^a bears. In witness whereof we have hereunto set our hands, the day and ^b year above written.

Hen. Paman, Orat. Publicus.

Hen. More, D.D.

Ra. Widdrington, S.T.D. et D. Marg. P.

^cThere is a second certificate in Burnet^d: but we omit it as unnecessary.

The Mandate of Barlow for the inthroning of Parker bears date the 31st of December. That of the Archdeacon of Canterbury to the Chapter for the same purpose is dated the 1st of January 1560. The Procuration of Parker, addressed to Edward Leades and some others of his Chaplains, to take possession in his name is dated the 2nd of January; and the Act of Investiture the 21st of March. The three first Acts are given by Bramhall, p. 1047. & seqq. and the last by Rymer, vol. 15, p. 573. As these documents are not essential, we think it enough to mention them, and refer thither such as may wish to consult them.

In order, however, to leave nothing wanting on this subject, we shall give, in the next Article, Attestations which will furnish proof of the falseness of the Ordination of Parker in a Tavern.

§ V. *Copy of a certificate sent to attest the verification of the Records given in Bramhall's Works, among which is found the Record of Parker's Consecration, and whereof I have deposited the Original in the King's Library [at Paris] the ninth of May, 1722.*

We whose names are subscribed do certify, that we have collated and compared together the Records of the Most Rev. Matthew Parker's Consecration printed in the Book^e intituled, *The Works of the Most Rev. Father in God John Bramhall D.D. late Lord Archbishop of Ardmagh, Primate and Metropolitan of all Ireland; printed at Dublin in the year 1677, in folio.* Which Records, with the exception of some passages hereinafter mentioned, we have found very conformable to the Original, which is preserved in the Archives of the Archiepiscopal Palace at Lambeth near London.

Pag. 1025. lin. 8. Registrum legit: *consecrandum et benedicendum fore.*

Pag. 1028. lin. 46. Registrum legit: *directis.*

Pag. 1029. lin. 24. Registrum legit: *opponere.*

Pag. 1033. lin. 29. Registrum legit: *semel tantum in omnibus.*

Pag. 1034. lin. 29. Registrum legit: *quo quidem die Martis, viz.*

[^a ^b In Burnet bears and year.]

omitted.—ED.]

[^c In both Mr. Williams's Editions the three following paragraphs were entirely

[^d Also in Bramhall's Works.—ED.]

[^e In Courayer, intitulé en Anglois.]

- Pag. 1036. lin. 30. Registrum legit : *quod comparerent et eorum.*
 Pag. 1038. lin. 10. Registrum legit : *jus et potestas.*
 Pag. 1039. lin. 29. Registrum omittit : *eligendi.*
 Pag. 1042. lin. 24. Registrum legit : *ad octavum dicit in vim.*
 Pag. 1044. lin. 10. [p. 331. lin. 22.] Registrum legit : *Regni Angliæ.*
 Ibid. lin. 19. [p. 331. lin. 30.] Registrum legit : *merito pro meris.*
 Ibid. lin. 44. [p. 332. lin. 8.] Registrum legit : *rerum præsentium.* [Pro e-
orum præsentium.]
 Ibid. lin. 47. [p. 332. lin. 11.] Registrum legit : *ferimus pro fecimus.*
 Pag. 1046. lin. 28. [p. 334. lin. 7.] Registrum legit : *et quatuor illi.*
Given at the Archiepiscopal Palace at Lambeth,
this 15th of March, O. S. 172½.

Signed in the presence of

William Ayerst, S. Th. Bac. et Eccles. Anglic. Presbyter.
James Piers, Jurisconsult.
Pat. Piers de Girardin, Doctor of the Sorbonne.
Ed. Wilkins, Sacræ Theologiæ Prof. Cantabrigiænsis,
Canonicus Cantuariensis.
 Reverendissimo in Christo Patri ac D.D. Guilielmo
 Div. Prov. Archiepiscopo Cantuariensi, à Sacris
 Domesticis.

ARTICLE VII.

ATTESTATIONS AGAINST THE FABLE OF PARKER'S CONSECRATION IN A TAVERN.

§ I. *The Attestation of the Bishop of Durham.*

^a Whereas I am most injuriously and slanderously traduced by a nameless authour, calling himself *N. N.* in a Book said to be printed at Rouen 1657, intituled (*A Treatise of the nature of Catholick Faith and Heresie*) as if upon the presenting of a certain Book in the Upper House, in the beginning of the late Parliament, proving, as he saith, the Protestant Bishops had no Succession, nor Consecration, and therefore were no Bishops, and by consequence ought not to sit in Parliament, I should make a speech against the said Book in my own and all the Bishops' behalf, endeavouring to prove Succession from the last Catholic Bishops (as he there styles them), who by imposition of hands ordained the first Protestant Bishops at the Nagges-head in Cheapside, as was notorious to all the world, &c.

I do hereby in the presence of Almighty God, solemnly protest and declare to all the world, that what this authour there affirms concerning me is a most notorious untruth, and a gross slander; for to the best of my knowledge and remembrance, no such Book as he there mentions was ever

^a Bramhall, vol. 1. [disc. 5.] c. 2. p. 432.

presented to the Upper House in that or any other Parliament that ever I sate in ; and if there had, I could never have made such a speech as is there pretended, seeing I have ever spoken according to my thoughts, and always believed that fable of the Nagges-head Consecration to have proceeded from the father of lyes, as the authentique records of the Church still extant, which were so faithfully transcribed and published by Mr. Mason, do evidently testifie. And whereas the same impudent libeller doth moreover say, that what he there affirms was told to many, by one of the ancientest Peers of England, present in Parliament when I made this pretended speech, and that he is ready to depose the same upon his oath, and that he cannot believe any will be so impudent, to deny a thing so notorious, whereof there are as many witnesses living, as there are Lords and Bishops that were that day in the Upper House of Parliament, &c. ; I answer, that I am very unwilling to believe any Peer of England should have so little sense of his conscience and honour, as either to swear, or so much as affirm, such a notorious untruth. And therefore for the justification of my self, and manifestation of the truth in this particular, I do freely and willingly appeal (as he directs me) to those many honourable persons, the Lords spiritual and temporal yet alive, who sate in the house of Peers in that Parliament, or to as many of them as this my protestation shall come to, for a true certificate of what they know or believe concerning this matter ; humbly desiring them, and charging it upon their souls, as they will answer it to God at the Day of Judgement, that they will be pleased to testifie the truth, and nothing but the truth, herein, to the best of their knowledge and remembrance, without any favour or affection to me at all. I cannot reasonably be suspected by any indifferent man, of denying any thing that I know or believe to be true, seeing I am so shortly, in all probability, to render an account to the Searcher of hearts, of all my words and actions, being now (at the least) upon the ninety-fifth year of my age. And I acknowledge it a great mercy and favour of God, that He hath reserved me thus long, to clear the Church of England and my self of this most notorious slander, before He takes me to Himself. For I cannot imagine any reason why this shameless writer might not have cast the same upon any of my Reverend Brethren as well as me, but onely that I being the eldest, it was probable I might be in my grave before this untruth could be taken notice of in the world. And now I thank God I can chearfully sing my *Nunc dimittis*, unless it please Him to reserve me for the like service hereafter ; for I desire not to live any longer upon earth, than He shall be pleased to make me His instrument to defend the truth, and promote His glory. And for the more solemn and full confirmation of this my free and voluntary protestation and declaration, I have hereunto set my hand and seal, this seventeenth day of July, *Anno Dom.* 1658.

THOMAS DURESME.

Signed, sealed, published, and declared in the presence of *Tho. Sanders sen. Tho. Sanders jun. John Barwick, Clerk. R. Gray. Evan Davies.*

I Tobias Holder, Public Notary, being requested by the Right Reverend Father in God Thomas Lord Bishop of Duresm, at the house of Thomas Sanders Esq., in the Parish of Flamstead, in the County of Hartford, in the year of our Lord, moneth, and day above specified, was then and there personally present, where and when the said reverend Bishop did sign, publish, and declare this his protestation and declaration above written to be his act and deed, and did cause his authentick episcopal seal to be thereto affixed, in the presence of the witnesses whose names are thereto subscribed; And did there and then likewise sign, publish, and declare as his act and deed, another of the same tenor written in paper, which he signed with his manual seal, in the presence of the same witnesses. All this I heard, saw, and therefore know to be done. In testimony whereof I have subscribed, and thereto put my usual and accustomed Notaries sign.

Tobias Holder, Publick Notary.

§ II. *Certificate of some [† other] Bishops.*

^bWhereas we the surviving Bishops of the Church of England who sat in the Parliament begun at Westminster the third day of November 1640, are required by our Reverend Brother the Lord Bishop of Duresm, to declare and attest the truth concerning an imputation cast upon him in the pamphlet of that nameless author mentioned in his protestation and declaration here prefixed; And whereas we are obliged to perform what he requesteth, both for the justification of the truth, and for the clearing of ourselves of another slanderous aspersion, which the same author casteth upon us, as if we had heard our said Reverend Brother make such a speech as is there pretended, and by our silence had approved what that libeller falsely affirmeth was delivered in it; We do hereby solemnly protest and declare before God and all the world, that we never knew of any such book presented to the House of Peers as he there pretendeth, nor believe any such was ever presented; and therefore could never hear any such speech made against it as he mentioneth, by our said Reverend Brother or any other, much less approve of it by our silence. And if any such book had been presented, or any such speech had been made, there is none among us so ignorant or negligent of his duty in defending the truth, but would have been both able and ready to have confuted so groundless a fable as the pretended Consecration of Bishops at the Naggs head, out of the authentick and known Registers of the Church still extant, mentioned and faithfully transcribed and published by Mr. Mason so long before. For the confirmation of which truth, and attestation of what our said Reverend Brother hath

[^b Ibid. p. 433.]

herewith protested and declared, we have hereunto set our hands. Dated the nineteenth day of July, *Anno Domini* 1658.

London. M. Eli. Br. Sarum. Bath and Wells. Jo. Roffens. Oxford.

§ III. *Another Certificate of some Peers.*

°We of the Lords temporal, whose names are here underwritten, who sat in the Parliament begun at Westminster the third day of November 1640, being desired by the Bishop of Duresm to testifie our knowledge concerning an imputation cast upon him, about a speech pretended to be made by him in that Parliament, more particularly mentioned and disavowed in his prefixed protestation, do hereby testifie and declare, that to the best of our present knowledge and remembrance, no such book against Bishops as is there mentioned, was presented to the House of Peers in that Parliament. And consequently that no such speech as is there pretended, was or could be made by him or any other against it. In testimony whereof we have signed this our attestation with our own hands. Dated the nineteenth day of July, *Anno Domini* 1658.

Dorchester. Rutland. Lincolne. Cliveland. Dover. Lindsey. Southampton. Devonshire. Monmouth.

§ IV. *Another Certificate of ^da Clerk of the Parliament.*

°Upon search made in the book of the Lords house, I do not find any such book presented, nor any entry of any such speech made by Bishop Morton.

Henry Scobel, Clerk of the Parliament.

ARTICLE VIII.

RECORDS CONCERNING BARLOW.

Since Barlow makes almost as great a figure in this Dissertation as Parker, and as it is upon the Ordination of the first, that that of the other in part depends, I have thought it essential to join to the preceding Proofs those which relate to Barlow, in order to leave nothing wanting in a matter so important. Some extracts from a Letter which a learned English Bishop wrote me not long ago, and which I shall place at the end of the Proofs, will serve to supply the place of some documents which we want, and fortify still more the convincing reasons we have produced to establish the consecration of Barlow.

§ I. *Commission to consecrate Barlow, dated the 22nd of Feb. 153 $\frac{1}{2}$.*

°Rex reverendissimo in Christo patri Thomæ Cantuariensi archiepiscopo, totius Angliæ primati, salutem. Sciatis quod electioni nuper factæ in ec-

[^{cc} Ibid. p. 434.]

[^d Bramhall has *the.*]

^a Rymer, vol. 14. p. 559.

clesia cathedrali Assavensi, per mortem, bonæ memoriæ, Domini Henrici Standishe ultimi episcopi ibidem, vacante, de venerabili et religioso viro Dom. Willielmo Barlowe priore domûs sive prioratûs de Bisham, ordinis S. Augustini Sarum diœcesis, in episcopum loci illius et pastorem, regium assensum adhibuimus et favorem : Et hoc vobis tenore præsentium significamus, ut quod vestrûm est in hac parte exequamini. In cujus, &c. Teste rege apud Westmonasterium 22 die Februarii.

§ II. *The restitution of the temporalities of the Bishopric of St. David's, dated the 26th of April 1536.*

^b Henricus VIII. &c. Sciatis quòd, quum cathedralis ecclesia Menevensis per mortem Richardi Rawlins, nuper episcopi Menev., nuper viduata, ac pastoralis solatio fuerit destituta, et vacaverit, eo prætextu omnes exitus, et proficua, firmæ, redditus, reversiones, cum commoditatibus et emolumentis temporalium episcopatûs illius a tempore mortis prædicti nuper episcopi, durante tempore vacationis episcopatûs illius, nobis jure prærogativæ nostræ regiæ pertinuerunt et spectaverunt, ac pertinere et spectare dignoscuntur ; quumque præcentor et capitulum dictæ cathedralis ecclesiæ post mortem prædicti episcopi, licentiâ nostrâ inde priùs obtentâ, dilectum et fidelem nostrum Willielmum Barlow, nunc dictæ ^c ecclesiæ cathedralis Menevensis per nos nominatum episcopum, in suum elegerunt episcopum et pastorem, reverendiss. in Chr. pater Thomas archiep. Cantuar. electionem illam acceptaverit et confirmaverit, ipsumque sic electum episcopum prædictæ ecclesiæ Menevensis præfecit et pastorem, sicut per literas patentes ipsius archiepiscopi inde directas nobis constat ; Nos nunc certis de causis et considerationibus nos specialiter moventibus, et ob sinceram dilectionem quam penes præfatum nunc episcopum gerimus et habemus, de gratia nostra speciali, ac ex certa scientia et mero motu nostris, dedimus et concessimus, ac per præsentem damus et concedimus, pro nobis, hæredibus, et successoribus nostris, quantum in nobis est, eidem nunc episcopo, omnia et singula, exitus, firmas, redditus^d, proficua, reversiones^e, advantagia, commoditates, feoda, et alia emolumenta quæcunque, cum omnibus et singulis suis pertinentiis et dependentiis omnium et singulorum honorum, castrorum, &c. In cujus rei testimonium, &c. Teste rege, 26 die Aprilis, &c.

§ III. *Parliamentary Writ[s] for the year 1536.*^e

^f Rex Archiepiscopo Cant., totius &c. Teste Rege apud Westmonasterium 27 die Aprilis, anno regni sui vicesimo octavo. Consimilia Brevia diriguntur . . . Episcopo Bangorensi ; Episcopo Menevensi ; Custodi spiritualitatis Episcopatûs Wintoniensis, ipso Episcopo in remotis agente ; &c.

^b Mason de Ministerio Anglicano, lib. 3. cap. 10, p. 365.

^c So Courayer : Mason has *dicti* and *reventiones*.

^d Read *reditus*, both here and else-

where.]

^e According to the laws of England the Writs are addressed only to consecrated Bishops.

^f Rymer, vol. 14. p. 563, 4.

§ IV. *Writ[s] for the year 1541, wherein Barlow is named before many Bishops certainly consecrated.*

§ Rex Archiepiscopo Cantuariensi, totius &c. Teste Rege apud Westmonasterium vicesimo tertio die Novembris, anno regni sui tricesimo tertio.

Consimilia Brevia diriguntur Episcopo Menevensi, Episcopo Norwicensi, Episcopo Landavensi, Episcopo Herefordensi, &c.

§ V. *Congé d' élire for a Bishop for the See of St. Asaph, after the translation of Bishop Barlow, dated the 29th of May 1536.*

§ Rex dilectis sibi in Christo decano et capitulo ecclesiæ nostræ cathedralis Assavensis, salutem.

Ex parte vestra nobis est humiliter supplicatum ut, cùm ecclesia nostra prædicta, per liberam transmutationem Willielmi Barlowe ultimi episcopi ibidem electi, sit pastoris solatio destituta, alium vobis eligendi in episcopum et pastorem licentiam concedere dignaremur, Nos precibus vestris in hac parte favorabiliter inclinati, licentiam illam vobis tenore præsentium duximus concedendam; mandantes quòd talem vobis eligatis in episcopum et pastorem qui Deo devotus, ecclesiæ vestræ necessarius, nobisque et regno nostro utilis et fidelis existat. In cujus &c. Teste rege apud Westmonasterium 29 die Maii. *Per Breve de privato sigillo.*

§ VI. *Commission to consecrate Robert Warton Bishop of St. Asaph, dated the 24th of June 1536.*

§ Rex reverendissimo in Christo patri Thomæ eadem gratiâ archiepiscopo Cantuariensi, totius Angliæ primati et metropolitano, salutem.

Cùm nuper, vacante sede episcopali Assavensi per liberam transmutationem Willielmi Barlowe ultimi episcopi ibidem electi, ad humilem supplicationem dilectorum nobis in Christo decani et capituli ecclesiæ nostræ cathedralis Assavensis, eisdem per literas nostras patentes licentiam concesserimus alium sibi eligendi in episcopum loci prædicti et pastorem, Ac iidem decanus et capitulum, prætextu licentiæ nostræ prædictæ, dilectum nobis in Christo Robertum Warton abbatem exempti monasterii S. Salvatoris de Bermondeseye sibi eligerint in episcopum et pastorem, Nos, electionem illam acceptantes, eidem electioni regium assensum nostrum adhibuimus et favorem, . . . Rogantes, &c. Teste rege apud Westmonasterium 24 die Junii. *Per Breve de privato sigillo.*

We might have added here Cranmer's Commission, directed in 154½ to John Bishop of Salisbury, William (Barlow) Bishop of St. David's, and John Bishop of Gloucester, for the Consecration of Arthur Bulkeley; but as the greater part of it will be found in the fragments of letters printed among the Proofs, it will be sufficient to have mentioned it.

§ Ibid. p. 737.

§ Ibid. p. 570.

§ Ibid.

§ VII. *Writ of nomination to the Bishopric of Bath, dated Feb. 26, 1547.*

We have inserted this Record entire, because it is the first given in Rymer's Collection by which it appears that the King had appropriated to himself the nomination of Bishops, taking away from the Chapters the right of Election.

^j Rex omnibus ad quos &c. salutem. Cùm, per quendam Actum in Parlamento nostro inchoato apud Westmonasterium 4 die Novembris anno regni nostri primo, ac ibidem tento, inter alia statuta pro Republicâ nostrâ edita, ordinatum enactum et stabilitum fuerit quòd nullum Breve de Licentiâ Eligendi (vulgariter vocatum *Congé d' Eslier*) deinceps concessum foret, nec electio alicujus Archiepiscopi seu Episcopi per Decanum et Capitulum fieret, Sed quòd nos, per Literas nostras Patentes, quolibet tempore cùm aliquis Archiepiscopatus seu Episcopatus vacaret, alicui personæ ^kquem nos idoneum existimarem, eundem conferre possemus et valeamus, Et eadem collatio, sic per Literas nostras Patentes hujusmodi personæ factas et deliberatas, cui nos in eundem conferremus Archiepiscopatum seu Episcopatum, seu ejus sufficienti procuratori vel attorney, staret et foret, ad omnia intentiones constructiones et proposita, tanti et consimilis effectûs quanti et qualis foret, sive Breve de Licentiâ Eligendi concessum, electio rite facta, et eadem confirmata fuissent, Et quòd, post hujusmodi collationem, eadem persona, cui hujusmodi Archiepiscopatus seu Episcopatus foret collatus seu datus, posset consecrari, et habere liberationem suam, seu Breve de Amoveas manum, ac omnia alia agere prout eadem ceremoniæ et electiones fuissent factæ et actæ, prout in eodem Statuto pleniùs liquet;

Ac cùm Episcopatus Bath. et Well. hoc tempore sit vacuus, suoque idoneo Pastore destitutus, morte Rev. Patris, piæ memoriæ, Willielmi nuper illius loci Episcopi, et ob id ad munus nostrum Regium pertinere dinoscatur alium in ejus locum surrogandum, qui ob eximias animi dotes populum nostrum illius diœcesis latè patentis, juxta Divi Pauli normam, dignè pascat;

Sciatis quòd nos, Existimantes Rev. Patrem Willielmum Menev. Episcopum ad Episcopatum prædictum modò vacantem idoneum tam propter singularem sacrarum literarum doctrinam, moresque probatissimos, quibus idem Rev. Pater modò Episcopus Menevensis præditus est, quàm propter hoc quòd juxta Salvatoris nostri elogium judicamus illum virum imprimis dignum esse, ut super multa constituatur, qui super pauca fuerat fidelis, Ex gratia nostra speciali, ac ex certa scientia et mero motu nostris, necnon de avisamento et consensu præcarissimi Avunculi et Consiliarii nostri Edwardi Ducis Somersetiæ, personæ nostræ Gubernatoris, ac Regnorum, Dominiorum, subditorumque nostrorum quorumcumque Protectoris, cæterorumque Consiliariorum nostrorum, Contulimus, dedimus, et concessimus, ac per præsentem conferimus, damus, et concedimus præfato Rev. Patri Willielmo nunc Menev.

^j Rymer, vol. 15. p. 169.

[^k So Rymer: Courayer has *quam nos idoneam.*]

Episcopo prædictum Episcopatum Bathon. et Wellen., ac eundem Willielmum in Episcopum Bath. et Well. transferimus per præsentés, ac ipsum Willielmum Episcopum Bath. et Wellen. ac Diœcesanum Bathon. et Wellen. prædictæ nominamus facimus ordinamus creamus et constituimus per præsentés,

Habendum, tenendum, occupandum, et gaudendum prædictum Episcopatum Bathon. et Well. eidem Willielmo, durante vita sua naturali, unâ cum omnibus dominiis, maneriis, terris, tenementis, hereditamentis, possessionibus, et juribus, tam spiritualibus quàm temporalibus, ac cum omnibus aliis proficuis, commoditatibus, emolumentis, auctoritatibus, jurisdictionibus et præeminentiis quibuscumque, eidem Episcopatui Bath. et Well. quoquo modo spectantibus, pertinentibus, sive incumbentibus; Eò quòd expressa mentio &c. In cujus rei &c. Teste Rege apud Westmonasterium tertio die Februarii. *Per Breve de privato sigillo.*

In consequence of this nomination and investiture to the Bishopric of Bath, we find in the same volume of Rymer a deed of Bishop Barlow's¹, signed in his Chapter, whereby he exchanges several lands belonging to his Church, for others which are granted him by King Edward; and Mason^m on his part, has published two deeds of King Edward's, which answer to that of Barlow. As however there is nothing particular in these deeds with regard to the Consecration of this Prelate, which they merely presuppose by the proof they furnish of the possession he enjoyed of the temporalities of the Church of Bath, we shall content ourselves with having mentioned them, without transcribing them.

§ VIII. *Congé d' élire to the Bishopric of Bath, vacant by the resignation of Barlow, dated March 13. 155 $\frac{3}{4}$.*

ⁿ Regina dilectis nobis in Christo Decano et Capitulo Ecclesiæ Cathedralis Wellensis, salutem. Cùm Ecclesia nostra Cathedralis prædicta, per liberam et spontaneam resignationem in manus nostras ultimi Episcopi ibidem, jam sit Pastoris solatio destituta; Nos alium vobis eligendi in Episcopum et Pastorem^o duximus concedendum; Mandantes quòd talem vobis eligatis in Episcopum et Pastorem, qui sacrarum literarum cognitione ad id munus aptus, Deo devotus, nobis et Regno nostro utilis et fidelis, Ecclesiæque nostræ prædictæ necessarius existat. In cujus rei &c. Teste Reginâ apud Westmonasterium, 13 die Martii. *Per Breve de privato sigillo.*

¹ Vol. 15. p. 171.

^m Book 3. c. 10. p. 367.

ⁿ Rymer, vol. 15. p. 369.

[^o For *duximus concedendum*, read or understand the regular form, *licentiam per præsentés duximus concedendam*.]

§ IX. *Commission of Queen Mary to consecrate the successor of Barlow in the Bishopric of Bath, dated March 28. 1554.*

^p Regina &c. Omnibus Archiepiscopis, Episcopis, vel aliis quibuscumque, quorum in hac parte intererit, salutem.

Vacante nuper sede Episcopali infra Ecclesiam nostram Cathedralē Wellensem per deprivationem et amotionem ultimi Episcopi ibidem [Wil. Barlow], Decanus et Capitulum ejusdem Ecclesiæ (licentiâ priùs a nobis per eos alium eligendi in eorum Episcopum et Pastorem petità pariter et obtentâ) discretum virum Magistrum Gilbertum Bourne, S. Theologiæ Bachalareum, in eorum Episcopum et Pastorem ^qcanonicè elegerunt et nominaverunt, sicuti per eorum literas, quas vobis mittimus præsentibus inclusas pleniùs liquet; Vobis significamus, &c. Teste Reginâ apud Westmonasterium, 28 die Martii. *Per ipsam Reginam.*

A proof that no consequence can be drawn against the Consecration of Barlow from the words found in the preceding Commission, *per deprivationem et amotionem ultimi Episcopi*, is, that in the Writ for the restitution of the temporalities of Bath given to his successor, and after the date of this Commission, it is said that this See was vacant *per liberam resignationem* of Barlow. It is the same Rymer who gives this document which we shall here transcribe.

§ X. *Writ for the restitution of the temporalities of the Bishopric of Bath, dated April 20. 1554.*

^q Regina Escaetori suo in Comitatu Somersetiæ, salutem.

Vacante nuper Episcopatu Bathoniensi et Wellensi per liberam resignationem ultimi Episcopi ibidem, Decanus et Capitulum Ecclesiæ Cathedralis Wellensis prædictæ (licentiâ nostrâ primitus petità pariter et obtentâ) dilectum nobis Magistrum Gilbertum Bourne S. Theologiæ Bacalarium in eorum Episcopum et Pastorem elegerunt. Cui quidem electioni et personæ sic electæ Regium assensum nostrum adhibuimus pariter et favorem, ipsiusque Electi fidelitatem, nobis pro dicto Episcopatu debitam, cepimus, ac temporalia Episcopatûs illius, prout moris est, restituimus eidem, habenda et percipienda eidem Electo, a tempore vacationis Episcopatûs illius.

Et ideo tibi præcipimus, quòd eidem Electo, temporalia prædicta cum pertinentiis in Balliva tua sine dilatione liberes in forma prædicta; salvo jure cujuslibet.

Teste Reginâ apud Westmonasterium 20 die Aprilis.

This Record proves clearly, that Barlow himself had freely resigned his Bishopric; that he did not wait to be deposed; and that the sentence of deposition was a subsequent addition which came

^p Rymer, vol. 15. p. 376.

^q Ibid. p. 384.

in only as an after-stroke, in order to deprive that Prelate of all hope of a return.

§ XI. *Commission given to Parker to confirm Barlow in the See of Chichester, dated December 18. 1559.*

† Regina &c. Reverendissimo in Christo Patri Dom. Matheo Archiepiscopo Cantuariensi, totius Angliæ Primate et Metropolitano, salutem.

Cùm, vacante nuper sede Episcopali Cicestrensi^s, per mortem Johannis Christopherson ultimi Episcopi ejusdem, ad humilem petitionem Decani et Capituli Ecclesiæ nostræ Cathedralis Cicestrensis, eisdem per literas nostras patentés licentiam concesserimus alium sibi eligendi in Episcopum et Pastorem Sedis prædictæ, iidemque Decanus et Capitulum vigore et obtentu licentiæ nostræ prædictæ dilectum nobis in Christo Magistrum Willielmum Barloo Sacræ Theologiæ Professorem, ac nuper Episcopum Bathon. et Wellen. sibi et Ecclesiæ Cicestrensi prædictæ elegerunt in Episcopum et Pastorem, prout per literas suas patentés, sigillo eorum communi sigillatas, nobis inde directas, pleniùs liquet et apparet,

Nos electionem illam acceptantes, eidem electioni regium nostrum assensum adhibuimus pariter et favorem, et hoc vobis tenore præsentium significamus: Rogantes, et, in fide et dilectione quibus nobis tenemini, firmiter præcipiendo mandantes, quatenùs eundem Magistrum Will. Barloo in Episcopum et Pastorem Ecclesiæ Cathedralis Cicestrensis prædictæ sic ut præfertur electum, electionemque prædictam confirmare, cæteraque omnia et singula peragere, quæ vestro in hac parte incumbunt officio pastorali, juxta formam et effectum statutorum in ea parte editorum et provisorum, velitis cum effectu. In cujus rei &c.

Teste Regina, apud Westmonasterium 18 die Decembris.

† *Examinatur cum Recordo*

Junii 19, A. D. 1721.

per me Robertum Sanderson.

In this Record as published by Rymer^u, after these words: *electionemque prædictam confirmare*, we read these: *et eundem Magistrum Willielmum Barloo Episcopum et Pastorem Ecclesiæ prædictæ consecrare*; but these last words are not found either in the Archives of the Tower, or in Parker's Register, and it is indisputable from the Proofs which have been given, that this clause was transcribed by that Compiler only through inadvertence and oversight, as is attested^x above by Mr. Sanderson, and by others who have consulted the original of this Record.

† Pat. [† 14.] 2. Eliz. m. 5. Reg. Parker, fol. 24. 40.

[^s Rymer has *Cicestrensis*.]
[† This Certificate is not in the French edition.—ED.]

^u Vol. 15. p. 550.

^x So Mr. Williams: compare note t. The French has, "by those who since his time have examined the originals of this Record."

§ XII. *Writ for the restitution of the temporalities of the Bishopric of Chichester, granted to Barlow by Queen Elizabeth, March 27. 1560.*

⁊ Regina Escactori suo in Comitatu Middlesexiæ, salutem.

Vacante nuper Episcopatu Cicestrensi, per mortem naturalem Reverendi in Christo Patris Joh. Christoferson ultimi Episcopi ibidem, Decanus et Capitulum Ecclesiæ Cathedralis Cicestrensis prædictæ, licentiâ nostrâ petitâ pariter et obtentâ, dilectum Capellanum nostrum Willielmum Barlow Sacræ Theologiæ Professorem ac nuper Episcopum Bathon. et Wellen. in eorum Episcopum et Pastorem elegerunt,

Cui quidem electioni et personæ sic electæ Regium assensum nostrum adhibuimus pariter et favorem, ipsiusque fidelitatem nobis debitam pro dicto Episcopatu recepimus, ac temporalia ejusdem Episcopatûs (exceptis omnibus maneriis, terris, &c.) eî restituimus per præsentem.

Et ideo tibi præcipimus, quòd præfato Electo temporalia prædicta cum pertinentiis (exceptis præexceptis) in Balliva tua, unâ cum exitibus et proficuis inde provenientibus sive crescentibus a festo S. Michaelis Archangeli ultimò præterito, sine dilatione liberes; salvo jure cujuslibet.

Teste Reginâ apud Westmonasterium 27 die Martii.

This Record is a new proof of the Consecration of Barlow; for none of the new Bishops having received the investiture of their temporalities till after their Consecration, and the Queen's Commission having been only for confirming Barlow, it follows evidently, that they believed that he had been consecrated long before.

ARTICLE IX.

FRAGMENTS OF LETTERS^{aa} WRITTEN TO THE AUTHOR.

De Consecratione Barlovii nihil in Registro Cranmeri occurrere, et tu ipse observas, et ego, nisi sæpiùs evoluto Registro illo maximè fallor, fidenter asserere valeam. In Archivis Assavensibus nullum Barlovii Registrum omnino invenitur; neque aliquid ab illo in eo Episcopatu actum, quod in Registrum inseri debuit. In Menevensibus sunt quidem aliorum quorundam Episcoporum Registra; sed uti major eorum pars dudum perierit, ita inter cætera illud Barlovii desideratur. Casu hoc an consultò factum, dicere nequeo: hoc tantùm ex instrumento publico comperi,^a “Robertum
“Farrar, Barlovii in Episcopatu Menevensi successorem, autoritate Regia
“Sedis suæ libros Ecclesiasticos, Martyrologia, Portiforia, Missalia, cum
“Calendariis in quibus nomina Episcoporum tempusque eorum admissionis,

^y Vol. 15, p. 576.

[^{aa} See the introduction to Article VIII.]

^a Inquisitio facta 17. April. 4. Ed. VI. de vacatione Episcopi Menev. inter MSS. Wharton L. p. 239.

“ mortis, translationis inscribi solebant,” flammis commisisse, ex quibus aliter hæc tam anxie quæsitæ consecratio fortasse probari potuisset.

In Ecclesia Metropolitana Cantuariensi unde commissiones pro consecrationibus Episcoporum Provinciæ extra Ecclesiam suam Cathedralē concedi solebant, ex ruinis variis nuperoque incendio quædam Registra evaserunt. In illis adhuc apparent commissiones quindecim pro consecrandis Episcopis, ab anno 1506 ad annum 1531. Ab illo anno, usque ad 1541, Acta omnia periere. Cætera Provinciæ Registra eò minùs moror, quòd ex more disciplinæ nostræ, ubicumque demum consecratus fuerit Barlovius, sive in Ecclesia aliqua Cathedrali sive (quod potiùs crediderim) in sacello alicujus Episcopi, alteriusve cujusdam in dignitate Ecclesiastica constituti, et oratorium intra ædes suas habentis, *Acta Consecrationis* non in Registrum loci illius, ubi res gesta fuerat, referri deberent, sed in instrumento separato inscribi, et *ad Archiepiscopum Cantuariensem*, cujus commissionis vigore res transacta fuerat, protinus transmitti.

Et quid demum ipsum *Champnæum* impulerit, ut de consecratione Barlovii dubitaret? An famâ publicâ ad ejus cognitionem hic defectus pervenerit, quæ quamvis sæpiùs mendax, aliquando tamen vera refert? An aliquo idoneo authore rem didicit? nec hoc quidem dicere potuit. Sufficit ei quod in Cranmeri Registro hujus consecrationis acta non occurrant^b, ac proinde de consecratione ejus meritò esse dubitandum. Fatemur libenter. Sed nec aliorum plurium Episcoporum, de quorum tamen consecratione, nec *Champnæus*, si viveret, dubitandum censeret: imò de quorum consecrationibus, ex aliis publicis instrumentis certò nobis constat.

Foxius Herefordensis nullibi in illo Registro consecratus invenitur. Ex Rymero^c consecratum fuisse comperimus, idque 26 die Septembris anno 1535, uti in ipsius Registro inter nuperi Episcopi Eliensis Codices MSS. asservato, expressè refertur.

^dSampson Cicestrensis, ^eLatimerus Wigorniensis, ^fHilsley Roffensis, omnes pro non consecratis habendi sunt, si quidem rectè *Champnæus* ex Registri Cranmeriani silentio eâ in re concludit. At ex publicis tabulis planè apparet quemlibet eorum ritè fuisse consecratum.

De Reppis Norwicensi Episcopo, res adhuc manifestior. Acta consecrationis illius nullibi in Registro Cranmeri comparent; et tamen ex eodem ^gRegistro patet illum a Cranmero fuisse sacratum; certificante hoc Regi Archiepiscopo, et attestante, qui consecrationi ipsius interfuit, Notario Publico.

Gardineri Episcopi Wintoniensis nec *confirmatio*, nec *consecratio*, in Warhami Archiepiscopi Cantuar. Registro hodie invenitur. Hoc eò magis

^b Champn. de Vocatione Ministrorum, cap. 14. p. 489—491.

^c Ibid. p. 553.

^f Ibid.

^g Regist. Cranm. fol. 212.

^d Ibid. p. 573.

considerandum, quia consecrari quidem ab aliis potuit, confirmari nisi ab Archiepiscopo ejusve commissario non potuit: adeo tamen de hujus Episcopi et *confirmatione* et *consecratione* omnes tabulæ publicæ silent, ut inter eruditissimos harum rerum investigatores, nec de anno conveniat, quo confirmatus ac consecratus fuit. ^h Quo igitur jure de Barlovii caractere dubitatur, eodem de Ordine Episcopali Gardineri, summi horum hominum antesignani, dubitare necesse est.

Gardinerus primus fuit in commissione pro consecratione Bonneri Londinensis Episcopi, proximi eorundem zelotarum post Gardinerum ducis atque signiferi. Ab illo, assistentibus sibi Cicestrensi atque Herefordensi Episcopis, sacratus fuit *Bonnerus*ⁱ. Si igitur Parkeri consecratio ideo pro invalidâ sit habenda, quòd de Barlovii ordinatione sileant Registra, sequetur nec Bonnerum fuisse a Gardinero legitimè sacratum.

Infinitus essem si ad alios omnes ordine transirem, ab hujusmodi Episcopis sacratos. Unum omnino præterire non possum, eminentissimum Parkeri prædecessorem, *Cardinalem Polum*; cujus benedictioni sex aderant Episcopi. Horum duorum, Nicolai Heath Eboracensis Archiepiscopi, et Thomæ Thyrleby Eliensis Episcopi, consecrationes in Registris extant. Bonnerus, qui secundum in illo officio locum obtinuit, a Gardinero sacratus fuit, cujus consecratio nullibi in tabulis publicis reperitur. Et quanquam non adeo fidenter de cæteris pronuntiare libet, id tamen dicam, neque Patis Wigorniensis, neque Whiti Lincolnensis, neque Griffith Roffensis, neque Goldwelli Assavensis, consecrationes, quamvis diligenter quæsitæ, adhuc a me inventas esse, adeoque de sex illustrissimi Cardinalis consecratoribus quatuor sub eodem defectu cum Barlovio laborasse. Aut igitur Gardinerum, Bonnerum, et ipsum Reverendissimum Archiepiscopum Polum de suo ordine dejiciendos concedant hi cavillatores; aut, si hos canonicè consecratos fuisse contendunt, non obstante Registorum silentio, de quo nos minimè dubitamus; quod æquum, quod justum, quod verum est fateantur, neque de consecratione Matthæi Parkeri dubitari posse: præsertim cùm constet non modò tres de quatuor ejus consecratoribus, certissimè fuisse sacratos, sed et ipsum quartum, invictis probationibus, Episcopalem characterem habuisse ostenditur.

Ex his tam multis et variis exemplis, apparet quàm infirmum, quàm incertum, quàm planè nullum sit Champnæi argumentum contra Barlovii consecrationem. Quòd si a me quæras, cur hujusce consecrationis Acta in Registrum Cranmeri aut nunquam relata fuerint, aut si aliquando in illo describerentur, postea exciderint; et mihi vicissim te rogare liceat, cur tot aliorum Episcoporum consecrationes in eodem Registro non inveniuntur? et præcipuè illorum Episcopo-

^h Godwin de Præsulibus, an. 1534. sic Wharton, Angliæ Sacræ vol. 1. p. 519. at Rymer. vol. 14. p. 429. temporalia ei restituta ostendit Decemb. 5. 1531. et licentia

pro ejus consecratione emanavit 27 Nov. ejusdem an. ut ex Regist. Cantuar. patet.

ⁱ Reg. Cranm. fol. 259.

rum qui eodem ferè tempore cum Barlovio consecrati fuerant : Foxii Herefordensis, Latimeri Wigorniensis, Sampsonis Cicestrensis, Hilsley Roffensis, quorum omnium consecrationes infra annum factæ, in Registro Cranmeri desiderantur? Post ducentos et amplius annos, de hujusmodi defectibus vix aut ne vix quidem hariolari datur. Ego sanè adeò longè absum ut quæram, cur quædam consecrationes in illius Registro non appareant, ut potiùs mirandum censeam tot adhuc nobis relinqui; imò totum Registrum in eodem cum domino suo rogo non interiisse.

Ut enim de privatis hujusmodi Actuum perditoribus nihil dicam, constat commissiones publicè sub Regina Maria emanasse ad Registra aliaque ejusmodi Acta inspicienda; fdisque hominibus id negotii datum, ut quidquid invenerint, vel contra veterem Ecclesiasticam institutionem, vel contra Romani Pontificis auctoritatem a se restitutam antea factum, penitus delerent. Quid hi fecerint cum Registro Cranmeri, quis hominum nunc viventium vel dicere vel hariolari potest? Forte igitur etiam hujus consecrationis Acta olim in hoc Registrum inserta fuerint, quamvis in eo frustra hodie quærantur. Certè suspicione non caret, quòd tot Episcoporum consecrationes eodem tempore factæ ex illo exciderint; quorum plerique notoriè dignoscuntur Regio Suprematui et Reformationi Religionis impensè favisse. Fortasse nec ab initio in illud referebantur. Ut enim de cæterorum consecrationibus nihil amplius dicam, Barlovius confirmatus fuit Episcopus Assavensis 23 die Febr. an. 1535. Absens tum erat ab Urbe, in regiis negotiis extra Regnum occupatus. Hinc confirmatio ejus per procuratorem facta, et ipse verisimiliter vigore commissionis Archiepiscopalis ruri consecratus. Eo ipso tempore quo hæc facta fuerint, mortem obiit Ricardus Rawlins Menevensis Episcopus 18 die ejusdem mensis. In ejus locum substitutus est Barlovius tantâ cum celeritate, ut decimo die insequentis Aprilis illius electio per Præcentorem et Capitulum Menevense expedita fuerit, vigesimo primo confirmatio facta. Intra hoc tam angustum temporis spatium, Barlovius ad duos Episcopatus, Assavensem et Menevensem electus, confirmatus, et, ut nos constanter asserimus, etiam Episcopus consecratus fuit. Quid mirum si in tot rebus tam brevi temporis curriculo faciendis, quædam negligenterentur, quæ ordinariè fieri consueverunt? et consecrationis Barlovianæ Acta vel ad Archiepiscopum non omnino mitterentur, vel ab Actuario in Registrum illius non inscriberentur? cui fortè absurdum videbatur consecrationem Barlovii ad Episcopatum Assavensem illic inserere, qui antequam id fieri potuit, ad Episcopatum Menevensem a Rege nominatus, fortè et a Capitulo fuerat electus.

Atque hinc patet (ut etiam illud in transitu observem) cur Barlovius in litteris regiis totoque processu electionis successoris sui Roberti Warton, dictus fuit *Assavensis Electus*. Cùm enim certum sit, illum nunquam possessionem Episcopatus Assavensis habuisse, cùm nec in sedem Episcopalem installatus fuerit, neque a Rege temporalia acceperit; cum denique nec de

confirmatione, nec de consecratione illius Capitulo Assavensi aliquo legitimo modo constiterit; ut non solùm ex Actorum Publicorum hac in parte silentio, verùm etiam ex ipsa temporis brevitate inter confirmationem ejus in Episcopum Assavensem, et electionem in Episcopum Menevensem, meritò concludi possit; sequitur eum quantumvis reipsa ut certò scimus *confirmatum*, et ut par est credere, etiam *consecratum*; respectu tamen sedis Assavensis, nihil amplius quàm *Episcopum Electum* jure dici potuisse, utpote cujus nec confirmatio nec consecratio illius Ecclesiæ Capitulo in debita juris forma fuisset certificata.

Neque hîc considerare oportet illud temporis spatium quod intercessit inter Barlovii dimissionem sedis Assavensis, et successoris sui electionem, atque consecrationem; cùm omnia quæcumque dicta sint de Barlovio in illo electionis et confirmationis Wartonianæ processu, respiciunt solùm illud tempus quo fuerat Episcopus Assavensis. Et vel intra illud spatium consecrari potuit Barlovius Episcopus Assavensis, ac nihilominus rectè appellari *Episcopus Electus*, si nec illa consecratio Decano et Capitulo Assavensi ritè significata fuerat, nec ulla installatio, aut temporalium restitutio exinde sit secuta, ut sanè clarè apparet nullam secutam fuisse. Atque in hîc consentientem nobiscum habemus ipsum Champnæum^k, ne quid dicam de Henrici VIII. Statuto^l de creandis Episcopis facto; ubi omnes Episcopi tamdiu pro *Electis* habendi censentur, donec omnia quæ ad eorum perfectam constitutionem eâ lege requiruntur, sint peracta; quæ in hoc Barlovii casu, respectu Sedis Assavensis, nunquam peragebantur.

Quod ad titulum spectat *Electi Assavensis*, Barlovio, in processu electionis atque confirmationis Wartoni successoris ejus, attributum; quoniam ea quæ de eo antea scripsi, nondum tibi plenè satisfecerint, rem ipsam paulò fusiùs clariùsque exponam. Atque hîc ante omnia observandum, in ^m *Statuto de electione, confirmatione, et consecratione Archiepiscopi sive Episcopi* duos tantùm titulos recenserit eorum, qui ad hujusmodi dignitates admittuntur: quorum alter est restrictior, dum processus adhuc incompletus manet, nec ad finem, modo lege illâ constituto, perducitur; scilicet *Domini Electi*: alter generalis, *Episcopi*, sive *Archiepiscopi* Dioceseos, ad quam quis fuerat electus.

Electione igitur Episcopi a Decano et Capitulo factâ, Regique sub eorum sigillo communi certificatâ, exinde vigore illius statuti, qui sic eligitur nomine Domini Electi talis Dioceseos gaudere decernitur. Postquam verò autoritate Regiâ confirmatus et consecratus fuerit, virtute ejusdem statuti in omnibus accipi jubetur juxta nomen, titulum, gradum, et dignitatem Episcopi Dioceseos ad quam electus fuerat, omniaque munia quæ ad suam dignitatem spectant, ut alius quivis Archiepiscopus, sive Episcopus, præstare permittitur. Hæc summa est illius statuti; atque hinc apparet, Episcopum

^k Cap. 14. p. 506.

^lm Stat. 25. Henr. VIII. cap. 20.

ante electionem factam, Regique certificatam, nullum omnino titulum de jure habere; postquam hoc fuerit perfectum, titulo Domini Electi insigniri: ubi verò electio sic certificata etiam confirmata fuerit, ac (si opus sit) consecratio facta, tum demum jus illi dari ad nomen, titulum, gradum, et dignitatem Episcopi Dioceseos ad quam electus et confirmatus fuerat.

Et ne de hac nostra illius statuti expositione dubites, confirmationem illius omni exceptione majorem tibi exhibebit formula consecrationis Episcopalis; quæ cum statutis Regni sæpiùs stabilita fuit, etiam ipsa vim legis obtinere censetur. In hac forma primùm Episcopus Electus a duobus Episcopis Archiepiscopo præsentari jubetur, idque ut in Episcopum consecratur. Præsentatus his verbis juramentum obedientiæ canonicæ Archiepiscopo præstat: “Ego *Electus Episcopus* talis Ecclesiæ et Sedis, promitto, &c.” In Litaniam, suffragium pro consecrando hoc modo concipitur: “Ut Deus *Fratri Electo* benedicere dignetur.” Examinatione peractâ, *Episcopus Electus* habitu se Episcopali induit. Et denique cæteris precibus finitis, cum jam ad ipsum actum consecrationis processuri sunt Archiepiscopus eique assistentes Episcopi, jubetur Episcopus Electus genua flectere, dum manus illi imponuntur. Quo peracto, et jam consecrato Electo, statim nomen Episcopi illi confertur; et noviter consecratus Episcopus, cum reliquis præsentibus communicare de corpore et sanguine Christi mandatur. Adeo certò constat usque ad ipsum consecrationis articulum, nullum aliud nomen alicui de jure competere, quàm illud *Episcopi Electi*; quamvis honoris causâ Episcopi titulum absque aliqua ejusmodi additione, etiam in publicis instrumentis, nondum consecratis quandoque attribui videamus.

Quod ulteriùs addis, nullum tibi exemplum adhuc occurrisse alicujus Episcopi, nisi solius Barlovii, qui ejusmodi Electi titulo in Brevibus Regiis nominatur; si quidem id eodem sensu, quo Barlovius sic dictus est, intelligas, cum respectu scilicet ad priorem Episcopatum ad quem antea fuerat electus, ego sanè id minimè miror: Tres quippe solummodò Episcopos observavi, qui his ducentis annis proximè elapsis, ad secundas sedes transierint, antequam ad priores consecrati atque in eisdem installati fuissent. Horum primus est ⁿ Barlovius ille de quo hîc agitur; secundus Bonnerus, qui cum in legatione ultra mare diu detineretur, ad Episcopatum Herefordensem absens electus ac confirmatus est, eunque uno ferè anno tenuit non consecratus; ac deinde ad sedem Londinensem transiit, nondum in patriam reversus. Postquam in patriam rediit, et jam aliquot post confirmationem ejus in alteram illam sedem suam mensibus consecrandus esset; in Brevi Regio pro consecratione ejus, idem hic titulus Episcopi Herefordensis Electi occurrit. Et quia illud instrumentum a Rymero omittitur, non abs re fuerit, hic integrum apponere.

HENRICUS VIII.^o, Dei gratiâ Angliæ et Franciæ Rex, Fidei Defensor,

ⁿ Reg. Cranm. fol. 241, 243.

^o Reg. Cranm. fol. 260.

Dominus Hybernæ, et in terra supremum caput Anglicanæ Ecclesiæ, Rev. in Christo Patri Thomæ Cantuariensi Archiep. totius Angliæ Primate et Metrop. salutem.

Quia nos de gratia nostra speciali, ac ex mero motu nostro, electioni nuper de dilecto et fideli consiliario nostro Edmundo Bonner, Episcopo Ecclesiæ Cathedralis Herefordensis Electo et Confirmato, ac jam in Episcopum et Pastorem Ecclesiæ nostræ Cathedralis S. Pauli London. per Decanum et Capitulum ejusdem Ecclesiæ ritè et legitimè factæ et celebratæ^p, prout per literas certificadorias eorundem Decani et Capituli sigillo suo sigillatas, nobis directas et deliberatas, pleniùs apparet, nostrum Regium Assensum adhibuimus, prout per præsentés adhibemus; Vobis per hæc scripta mandamus, quatenus hujusmodi electionem et Electum cum omni celeritate accommoda in Episcopum London. confirmetis, ac munus tam consecrationis quàm confirmationis eidem, quando ad hoc ex parte sua fueritis requisiti, debitè impendatis; ac cætera omnia et singula faciatis et exequamini, quæ vestro in hac parte incumbunt officio. In cujus rei testimonium has literas nostras fieri fecimus patentes. Teste meipso apud Walden 26 die mensis Martii, anno regni nostri 31.

H. Assheton.

In hoc Brevi illa equidem crassa vel ignorantia vel negligentia scriptoris observanda est, quòd Regio nomine Bonnerum mense Novembri antea confirmatum, nihilominus (pro more horum instrumentorum) confirmari ac consecrari jusserit. Illud rectè factum, quòd eum respectu utriusque sedis, tam Herefordensis quam Londinensis, non simpliciter Episcopum, sed *Electum* nominat, utpote nunquam illius, nondum hujus Dioceseos Episcopum.

Tertius post hunc sequitur Rev. P. Gulielmus Juxon^q, ad Episcopatum Herefordensem, uti antea Bonnerus, electus an. 1633, et ante consecrationem ad sedem pariter Londinensem translatus. In hujus Rev. P. processu omnia ad normam illius Wartonii expressè recensentur. Ipse Actorum titulus sic inscribitur: *Acta habita et facta in negotio confirmationis electionis factæ de personâ R. viri W. Juxon LL. D. Herefordensis Episcopi Electi, in Episcopum et Pastorem Ecclesiæ Cathedralis D. Pauli Lond. Nominati et Electi, die Mercurii, 23 viz. die mensis Octobris, A.D. 1633.*

In Brevi de Regio Assensu vocatur *Herefordensis Electus*^r; in procuratorio Decani et Capituli; in commissione Archiepiscopi; in summaria petitione pro confirmatione coram judice exhibita; in certificadorio de electione Archiepiscopo misso, alioque ipsi Episcopo oblato; in instrumento de illius consensu electioni adhibito; in sententia denique judicis definitiva, ubicumque nominis ejus mentio occurrit, semper eodem titulo Herefordensis

[^p "After the word *celebratæ* add [*Electo*]; although I believe this word is omitted in the Register, for which reason it ought to be within brackets." COURAYER, De-

fence of the present Work, vol. IV. p. cccxiv.]

^q Regist. Laud. fol. 12. a.

^r Ibid. fol. 13, 18.

Electi insignitur; etiam in actu consecrationis, consecratores dicuntur munus consecrationis Rev. viro Gul. Juxon Legum Doctori Herefordensi Electo, in Episcopum et Pastorem Ecclesiæ Cathed. D. Pauli London. *electo et confirmato*, impendisse: adeo nihil singulare in illa designatione Barlovii fuit; qui tamen in sua confirmatione in sedem Menevensis, solo Episcopi nomine ubique appellatur.

Sed ne te ulteriùs offendat titulus Electi Barlovio attributi, ad tuum te Rymerum remitto; ubi in Brevibus Regiis pro restitutionibus temporalium centies invenies Episcopos non solum confirmatos, sed et consecratos, eodem illo *Electorum* nomine appellatos. Cranmerus consecratus fuit 30 die Martii an. 1533. At nihilominus in Brevis pro restitutione temporalium suorum dato 29 die Aprilis proximè insequentis^s, dicitur tantum, Nuper Electus, et sub illo titulo, temporalia illi restituuntur. In restitutionibus temporalium plurimorum aliorum Episcoporum, consecratio eorum in ipsis Brevibus memoratur: attamen etiam hi eodem Electorum titulo designantur; licet non solum consecratos, verum etiam Episcopalibus insigniis investitos fuisse agnoscantur. En ipsa Brevium Regionum verba: ^t *Nos confirmationem et consecrationem illas acceptantes, fidelitatem ipsius Electi et Confirmati — cepimus. Et ideo tibi præcipimus quòd eidem Electo temporalia — liberes —. Et mandatum est militibus, &c. tenentibus de Episcopatu N. quòd eidem Electo tanquam Episcopo et Domino suo in omnibus quæ ad Episcopatum prædictum pertinent, intendentes sint et respondentes.* Atque hæc de titulo Episcopi Electi respondisse sufficiat.

Quod verò scribis a quibusdam excipi contra Barlovii consecrationem, illum scilicet non tam *Episcopum* quàm *usufructuarium* suorum Episcopatum fuisse, adeoque nulla benedictione Episcopali opus habuisse, facile refellitur. ^uAd Assavensem quippe Episcopatum modo legibus nostris præscripto nominatus, electus, confirmatus fuit. Hæc in usufructuario neque fiunt unquam, neque fieri debent. Ut enim totum hunc processum paulò distinctiùs consideremus; primò Capitulum Assavense Regi significavit mortem nuperi sui Episcopi Henrici Standish, ac petiit licentiam alium in locum illius eligendi. De quo hinc Episcopo agitur? De *usufructuario*, an de *Diæcesano Episcopo*? aut qualem sibi petunt eligendi facultatem? Alium in locum defuncti Episcopi, id est talem qualis ille mortuus Episcopus fuerat, et qualem Ecclesia sua atque Diæcesis suo destituta Pastore, ipsius loco exoptabant.

Rex votis Capituli annuit: licentiam eligendi Episcopum concedit: commendat Capitulo Barlovium, tanquam hominem idoneum ad *munus Pastoris sive Episcopi* exequendum. Quem credas hinc Episcopum designari? An *æconomum*, qui temporalia, uti vocant, Episcopatus administraret, et ex iis lautè viveret? an *Pastorem*, qui veri Episcopi officium ad commodum Eccle-

^s Rymer, tom. 14. p. 456.^t Ibid. p. 487, &c.^u Regist. Cramm. fol. 179.

siā atque Diœceseos exequeretur? Capitulum, hac licentiâ a Rege obtentâ, Barlovium sibi eligit in *Episcopum & Pastorem*: Archiepiscopus electionem confirmat: omnia fiunt ut in processu Diœcesani Episcopi et Pastoris, qualis et fuit et semper habitus est Barlovius.

In altero illo Episcopatu Menevensi sumendo iisdem gradibus per omnia progressus est. Capitulum Regi significavit mortem sui Episcopi, viduitatem Ecclesiæ, vacationem Episcopatûs, et licentiam petiit *alium sibi eligendi in Pastorem atque Episcopum* suæ Diœceseos. Concessa est a Rege quam petierat licentia. Electio a Capitulo facta, a Rege accepta, ab Archiepiscopo confirmata est; atque hæc omnia priûs quàm proventus sive redditus Episcopatûs (quos nos temporalia dicimus) illi restituti fuerint. Ex quibus omnibus planè apparet, Barlovium primò fuisse *Episcopum* factum, ac deinde ad usufructum sui Episcopatûs admissum, per *restitutionem* scilicet *temporalium*, quæ tum demum de jure fieri debet, postquam Episcopus per electionem, confirmationem, atque consecrationem, ad munus, sive ad officium Episcopi et Pastoris suæ Diœceseos plenè promotus fuerit, atque ad illud ritu legitimo admissus.

Quàm longè ab hoc processu in electione atque confirmatione Diœcesani Episcopi distet usufructuarii constitutio, ipsæ ejusmodi œconomorum literæ, quales apud Rymerum^x plures occurrunt, satis per se ostendunt. Et ne hac de re ullatenus dubites, alio argumento, ex tabulis publicis, perspicuè ostendam. In Summonitionibus ad Comitata Regni, quæ nos *Parliamenta* vocamus, omnes Archiepiscopi atque Episcopi infra Regnum Angliæ existentes Brevi Regio summonentur. Si quis Episcopus extra Regnum fuerit, aut si fortè Episcopatus aliquis vacare contigerit, loco Episcopi, *Custos Spiritualitatis* summonetur. Ut verò cognoscas, quis sit ille *Custos Spiritualitatis*, sciendum est quòd quoties aliquis Episcopatus Pastore suo destituitur, jurisdictio illius spiritualis ad Archiepiscopum Provinciæ devolvitur, uti reddituum administratio atque usufructus ad Regem. Et quemadmodum Rex ad temporalia recipienda et administranda certos suos Officiarios habet; ita Archiepiscopus ad spiritualia exercenda gravem aliquem virum Legum Ecclesiasticarum peritum nominat, qui exinde *Custos Spiritualitatis* vocatur. Hujus autoritas infra Diœcesim vacantem, vigore commissionis Archiepiscopi tam diu durat, donec novus Episcopus eligitur, et ab Archiepiscopo confirmatur; quo facto, jurisdictio spiritualis ad Episcopum confirmatum redit, et ab illo exerceri incipit. Ubi igitur aliquis *Custos Spiritualitatis* invenitur, qui jurisdictionem spiritualem infra Diœcesim administrat, ibi aut nullus omnino est Episcopus, aut Episcopus extra Regnum abiit, aut a jurisdictionis suæ exercitio ob causam aliquam suspenditur: **E** contra, si sit aliquis in Diœcesi Episcopus legitimè constitutus, ibi *Custos Spiritualitatis* nullus esse potest. Quibus sic expositis, clarissimè patet quòd *Episcopus*

^x Vol. 14. p. 268, 287, 8; [364;] 387, 8; [481, 2; 486.]

ad *Parliamentum* summonitus nomine *Episcopi* cujusvis *Diæceseos*, necessario pro vero loci illius *Episcopo* habendus sit. At in *Summonitionibus duorum Parliamentorum*, quorum alterum fuit anni 1536, statim post promotionem Barlovii ad *Episcopatum Menevensem*, alterum anni 1541, Barlovius summonitus fuit sub titulo *Episcopi Menevensis*. Nec inter *Custodes Spiritualitatis* ad illa *Parliamenta* summonitos, ullus *Episcopatus Menevensis Custos* ejusmodi occurrit^y; ac proinde certissimè constat *Episcopatum Menevensem* eo tempore non vacasse, sed *Episcopum suum Diæcesanum*, quales alii omnes *Episcopi* iisdem *Brevibus* summoniti fuerant, habuisse.

Hisce argumentis pro consecratione Barlovii adductis, et illud addere liceat, ipsum non solùm ad regni Comitata, *Brevibus Regiis*, nomine *Episcopi* sæpe fuisse summonitum; sed et ab *Archiepiscopo* ad *Synodos Provinciales* eodem nomine vocatum; atque in iis cum cæteris *Episcopis*, tanquam *Episcopus*, deliberasse, conclusisse, et conclusis cum fratribus subscripsisse.

Hujus argumenti vim ut clariùs percipias, notandum erit *Archiepiscopos* nostros ad *Synodos suas Provinciales*, literis suis mandatoriis, citare omnes suæ provinciæ *Episcopos*: absentium *Episcoporum*, si qui extra *Regnum* fuerint, *Vicarios in spiritualibus Generales*: *Episcopatum* denique vacantium *Custodes Spiritualitatis*, de quibus paullo antea diximus. Aliquando etiam *electi et confirmati*, quamvis nondum consecrati, *Episcopi* ad comparandum in hujusmodi *Synodis* summonentur; sed cum adjuncta semper restrictione *electorum et confirmatorum*. Cùm igitur Barlovius absque aliqua hujusmodi nota, ad has *Synodos* sæpius et citaretur ab *Archiepiscopo* sub simplici titulo *Episcopi*, eoque nomine cum cæteris *Episcopis* earum *Actis* subscripsit; quid aliud concludere possumus, nisi eum fuisse revera *Episcopum Diæcesanum*, non *Custodem Spiritualitatis*; *Episcopum* consecratum, non *electum et confirmatum* tantùm, cùm nulla ejusmodi restrictio nomini ejus adjecta appareat?

Anno 1536, paucis post promotionem ejus ad *Episcopatum Menevensem* mensibus, *Synodo Provinciali Londini* interfuit, atque *Articulis Religionis* in illo *Concilio* editis, penultimus *Episcoporum*, tanquam *Episcopus Menevensis* subscripsit^z.

In eadem *Synodo*, declarationi ejus de *Generalibus Conciliis* eodem modo manum suam apposuit^a.

Anno sequenti 1537, et *Synodo* interfuit, et libro de *Institutione Homini Christiani*, cum reliquis *Episcopis* subscripsit, ut ex ipsa ejus præfatione apparet.

^y Rymer, vol. 14. p. 564, 737.

^a MSS. Coll. Bened. Cantab. Miscell.

^z Burnet, Hist. Ref., Appendix, p. VIII. fol. 401.

Anno 1540, *Nationali Synodo* aderat, ac sententiæ ejus contra matrimonium Regis cum Anna Clivensi subscripsit^b.

Anno denique 1552, Synodo Provinciali tempore Edvardi VI. et præsens interfuit, et Articulis Religionis subscripsit^c.

In his omnibus, cum reliquis Episcopis, tanquam Episcopus egit; neque alio quàm Episcopi nomine perpetuò indigitatur.

Quod ex his exemplis apparet illi in publicis *Provinciae Synodis* fuisse tributum, etiam a privatis personis, iisque illi inimicissimis, concessum fuisse invenimus.

Gardinerus in Epist. ad Protectorem Regni, Ducem Somersetensem, contra concionem quandam illius scriptâ, eum nomine appellat *Domini Menevensis* Episcopi, et *Fratris sui Menevensis*^d. Et cùm postea, regnante Maria, religionis causâ idem Barlovius in carcerem conjectus fuit, et coram Commissariis Regiis adductus, inter quos *Gardinerus* præsidebat, adeo causam suam egit^e, ut non solum non ad rogum condemnatus fuerit, verùm etiam e carcere dimissus; Episcopatu suo tantùm, quem antea in manus Regias resignasse videtur, privatus. An sic credas illos hominem tractaturos, quem noverant per tot annos duos Episcopatus, absque aliqua consecratione tenuisse, etiam officium Episcopi impiè atque prophanè, si quidem ita se res habuisset, exercuisse; et pœnam adeo tali flagitio condignam meruisse?

Quid verò ipsa Regina, zelo seu potiùs furore contra Reformatos usque ad insaniam percita? Resignationem etiam illa Episcopatus Wellensis a Barlovio accepit: eumque, in *Licentia Eligendi novum Episcopum*, vacare pronuntiavit per resignationem ultimi Episcopi ibidem^f. Et rursus in *Brevi pro restitutione temporalium* successori ejus recitat Episcopatum vacasse per liberam resignationem ultimi Episcopi ibidem^g. Fidem tuam appello, vir eruditissime, siccine Regina locuta fuisset, si Barlovius nunquam fuisset sacratus? an non potiùs contra illum intonuisset, eumque ejecisset, tanquam invasorem nominis atque officii ad quod nullo jure, divino aut humano, ritè fuisset admissus?

Sed hîc obiter quæris, quomodo Barlovius, qui in his Brevibus dicitur *Episcopatum suum liberè resignasse*, in alio tamen Brevi, *de significavit*, ponitur *deprivatus*; et *Episcopatus ejus per deprivationem et amotionem ejus vacasse* declaratur? Quamvis de hac re nihil extra conjecturas proferre valeam, dicam tamen quod sentio, eoque liberiùs, quòd vel in illis literis, Barlovius tanquam verus Episcopus tractatur; atque sedes illa vacare refertur per deprivationem ultimi Episcopi ibidem.

Mariâ Reginâ sexto die Julii an. 1553 ad solium evectâ, Barlovius protinus captus fuit, et cum Joanne Cardmakero, Ecclesiæ suæ Præbendario in carcerem conjectus. Non diu illic detentus fuerat, cùm timore mortis per-

^b Regist. Cranm. fol. 141, 142.

^c Heylin, *Quinquarticular History*, chap. XIII. § 3. [See the Editor's notes.]

^d Fox, *Book of Martyrs*, vol. 2. p. 714, 715.

^e Id. vol. 3. p. 246.

^f ^g Rymer, vol. 15. p. 369, 384.

culus, ut, si quâ posset arte, salvus inde evaderet, Episcopatum suum in manus Regias resignavit: quam resignationem Regina accipiens 13 die Martii proximè insequentis, '*Decano et Capitulo Wellensi Licentiam Eligendi alium Episcopum in Ecclesiam suam Cathedralē*' concessit, '*per liberam et spontaneam resignationem ultimi Episcopi ibidem Pastoris solatio destitutum,*' ut in Brevi Regio^h recitatur. Quòd si suæ Ecclesiæ, ipsâ Reginâ testante, *Episcopus ac Pastor* fuit Barlovius, aut ego quid illis vocibus significetur omnino non intelligo, aut eo ipso fatendum est, eum revera fuisse in Episcopum consecratum, et pro tali a Regina publicè acceptum.

ⁱEodem die commissio emanavit Episcopo Wintoniensi Regni Cancellario, et aliis quinque Episcopis, ad deprivandum Archiepiscopum Eboracensem, ac Episcopos Menevensem, Cestrensem, et Bristolensem, eò quòd nuptias de facto, cum de jure non deberent, contraxissent. In hac commissione Barlovius omittitur, utpote qui jam antea Episcopatu suo ultro se spoliasset.

^kDuobus postea diebus, 15 die Martii, altera eisdem Episcopis commissio directa est, ad procedendum contra tres alios Episcopos, Lincolnensem, Wigornensem, atque Herefordensem; eosque (vigore clausulæ in concessione Episcopatum illorum ab Edvardo VI. Literis suis Patentibus insertæ, quòd nimirum eos tenerent, *quamdiu se bene gesserint*) de sedibus suis expellendos.

^lBarlovius interim adhuc in carcere custoditus, ut a mortis periculo se liberaret, nullum non lapidem movit, nec dubitavit etiam cum conscientiæ jactura saluti suæ consulere. Hinc primò librum olim contra Lutheranos a se scriptum, dum adhuc Regularis esset Canonicus, Gárdinero cæterisque Regiæ Commissariis, ut videtur, exhibuit; et vel ipse denuo imprimendum curavit, vel iis, ut illum imprimerent, commisit. Certè ante finem an. 1553, liber iste rursus editus fuit^m, cum Prefatione nova Ad Lectores contra Reformatos, quos deterrimis coloribus Editor depingit, et furiosâ rabie acriter perstringit. Neque hõc contentus, etiam petitionem Regiæ exhibuit, quâ omnes suos libros contra Religionem Catholicam scriptos ipse simul damnat ac revocat, Deoque gratias agit, quòd ex infinita sua bonitate se a tenebris in lucem, ex ignorantia mortali ad vivam veritatis cognitionem perduxisset; et sic denique Regiæ misericordiam implorat, seque illius beneplacito in omnibus submittit.

Dum hæc aguntur, Bournius ad Episcopatum Wellensem electus soli resignationi Barlovii fidere noluit; sed, ut ex Regio Assensu colligitur, etiam Episcopatu suo cum privandum duxit: hoc si revera factum sit (neque enim de deprivatione ejus aliquid alibi occurrit), tum ex tenore commissionum jam supra citatarum, tum ex toto processu Barlovii ante descripto,

^h Rymer, vol. 15. p. 369.

ⁱ Ibid. p. 370.]

^k Ibid. p. 370, 71.

^l Strype, Memorials Ecclesiastical and Civil, vol. 3. c. 18. p. 152—154.

^m *A Dialogue describing the originall ground of these Lutheran factions, and many of their abuses: compiled by Syr William Barlowe Chanon, late Byshop of Bathe. Anno 1553.*

sequetur eum vel conjugii sui causâⁿ, quod nullatenus dissimulare potuit, vel ob hæreticæ pravitatis crimen a seipso, ut ostendimus, recognitæ, a dignitate sua fuisse amotum: neque enim in tota petitione sua Regina oblata, aliud aliquid, nisi erroneæ doctrinæ confessio occurrit. Et cùm coram Commissariis Regiis unà cum Præbendario suo Cardmakero comparuit, °et de fide atque doctrina sua ab iis interrogaretur, illeque adeo vel cautè vel falsò respondit, ut quasi Catholicus ab iis dimitteretur,—de immani illo facinore, atque ultimo supplicio eorum sententiâ digno, quòd non consecratus, per tot annos officium Episcopi exercuisset, ne verbo quidem agebatur; neque tale aliquod crimen illi unquam objectum fuisse, in eorum temporum Actis memoratur.

Hæc igitur mea est sententiâ, Barlovium vel nunquam reipsa fuisse deprivatum, sed, ut alia omnia Instrumenta Regia et Registri Cantuariensis autoritas plane astruunt, Episcopatum suum sponte suâ resignasse; vel si, ad corroborandum Bournii titulum, sententiâ aliqua deprivationis in ipsum ferebatur, eam *ob confessæ hæreticæ pravitatis crimen, et scelera atque peccata enormia ab eo commissa* (scilicet quòd Episcopus ac Presbyter, ac olim etiam Canonicus Regularis, uxorem duxisset) latam fuisse, non quòd in Episcopum nunquam consecratus esset; cujus nulla prorsus vestigia in illius hominis vitâ aut factis inveniuntur.

Atque equidem cui bono scripta sua contra Catholicos edita revocasset; librum in Reformatos olim publicatum rursus in lucem emisisset; errores tot annis a se rejectos pro veris fidei articulis denuo recepisset; sed præcipuè Episcopatum suum in Regias manus resignasset; si tantum adhuc ac tam nefarium facinus sibi objiciendum cognovisset, quod nullâ arte vel dissimulare poterat, vel excusare? Aut quis credat Reginam resignationem Episcopatus Wellensis ab illo accipere voluisse, ac Episcopatum illum resignatione ejus Pastore vacuum pronuntiare: si vel minimam suspicionem habuisset adeo capitalis defectûs, quique eum non tam dignitate sua meritò privandum redderet, quàm nullo unquam justo titulo Episcopatum suum tenuisse ostenderet; sed sub Episcopi nomine usurpatorem honoris, officii, et beneficii fuisse, cujus prorsus incapacem se, suâ culpâ præstitisset?

Sic igitur credo Barlovium, ut vitæ suæ consuleret, Episcopatum suum in manus Regias voluntariè resignasse, adeoque illum verè, ut in aliis Brevibus recitatur, *per illius resignationem* vacasse: Bournium verò, qui illi successurus erat, non satis se securum putasse dignitatis illius, sic per resignationem vacantis, nisi Barlovius omnino ab illa judicialiter amotus atque deprivatus foret. Hoc perfacile fuit Bournio obtinere, contra hominem uxoratum; nec verebatur ne in eo Regina displiceret, quæ tales omnes, sive Episcopos, sive

ⁿ Hoc innui videtur in illo Decani et Capituli Cantuar. Registro, ubi sic annotatur: *Bathon. et Wellens. vacavit per resig-*

nationem Will. Barlowe conjugati; cui successit Gilbertus Bourne.

^o Fox, Book of Martyrs, vol. 3. p. 246.

Presbyteros, expressè *deprivari* mandaverat. Auxit proculdubio timorem Bournii quod eo ipso tempore acciderit *Miloni Coverdallio Episcopo Exoniensi*.^p Voyseius, prædecessor ejus, Episcopatum Exoniensem in manus Regis Edvardi VI. resignaverat. ^qRex illum Coverdallio concesserat 14 Augusti 1551. ^rMaria Voyscium ad suum Episcopatum restituit, Coverdallio absque ullo juridico processu ejecto; eo prætextu, quòd Voyseius ‘*propter justum tam animæ quàm corporis metum, rursus reddiderat et resignaverat Episcopatum suum Exon. in manus Regias; ac proinde,*’ “Nos”, inquit Maria, “. . . dictum venerabilem Patrem Johannem ad Episcopatum Exon. prædictum restituimus.” Vidit hoc et approbavit Bournius; ac ne simili modo ipse aliquando sua dignitate privaretur, cavere statuit homo, et alieno periculo cautior factus, et in negotiis plurimùm versatus; ideoque, non contentus resignatione Barlovii, quam satis cognoverat eo metu, qui in constantem virum cadere potuit, fuisse factam, eum per Commissarios Regios privari curavit, et in ipso confirmationis atque consecrationis suæ instrumento, in quo sola hæc deprivatio recitatur, expressè recenseri *Episcopatum Wellensem per deprivationem ultimi Episcopi vacuum fuisse*.

Hæc igitur, vir clarissime, meâ quidem sententiâ, vera ratio fuit hujusmodi processûs; cui Barlovius et libertatem suam et vitam debuit. Resignato quippe primum sponte suâ Episcopatu, et deinde ab eo deprivato, cùm ex vita ejus nullum jam superesset Bournio periculum, neque aliud aliquod crimen illi objiceretur, dimittendum hominem censuerunt, quod haudquaquam fecissent, si tam opportunè illi objicere potuerant, sacrilegè usurpatum, absque omni consecratione, ordinem atque officium Episcopi; quod nulli alteri, etiam ex illis quos fidei suæ causâ flammis tradiderunt, objectum legimus, aut etiam obiter imputatum.

Sic igitur hunc hominem tanquam verum Episcopum tractarunt inimici ejus, ipsumque, etiam cùm ab Episcopatu suo ejicerent, tamen pro Episcopo habuerunt. Quid de Parkero dicam, qui eum in consecratorum suorum numerum admisit, primasque illi partes in eo solemnibus officio concessit? An ignoravit illum, quamvis per tot annos pro Episcopo se gerentem, nunquam tamen fuisse ad ordinem munusque Episcopi sacratum? At hoc vetat et ætas et conditio Parkeri, qui cùm anno 1534 in familiam Reginae Annæ admissus fuerat, eodemque tempore triginta ad minimum annos natus, et non tantùm in curia versaretur, ubi hæc res agebantur, sed anno insequente coram Rege in Quadragesima concionatus est, id est eodem anno, fortè et mense, quo sacrari debuit, et nos sacratum fuisse Barlovium contendimus; quomodo ille id nescire potuit, in Aulâ Regiâ præsens, quod nec absentes latere credibile sit? Novit itaque Parkerus quis homo fuerat Barlovius.

Num igitur dicemus illum scientem, prudentem, a non-Episcopo consecrari voluisse? Quis talem amentiam viro et prudentissimo et cautissimo, impu-

^p Rymer, vol. 15. p. 282, 283.[^q Ibid. p. 283, seqq.]^r Ibid. p. 340.

taverit? At fortè necesse fuit illi talem consecratorem admittere. Scilicet non potuit a reliquis tribus, indubiè Episcopis, canonicè consecrari; aut ^s *Suffraganeum Thetfordensem, Episcopum Ossoriensem, Balcum*, loco Barlovii sumere? De quorum^t ordinationibus nemo nobis unquam litem moverit, aut movere potuit.

Atque hîc imprimis observare oportet, neque Statuta Regni, neque Canones Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ, Henrico Octavo regnante, aliquem permisisse in Episcopum consecrari, nisi a tribus aut pluribus Episcopis. Hoc adeo certum est, ut vel ipsi nostri adversarii liberè agnoscant. Hæc jura sub illius imperio unquam fuisse violata, nemo hactenus dixerit. Si igitur constet Barlovium etiam illis temporibus, non minùs quàm sub Elizabetha postea manus suas Episcopis consecrandis publicè imposuisse: si consecrationes sic ab illo cum duobus aliis Episcopis factæ, ab Archiepiscopo acceptæ, a Rege ipso approbatæ fuerint; quis dubitabit Barlovium, cùm hoc fecerit absque omni controversia, fuisse consecratum; neque aliter ei permissum fuisse alios Episcopos sacrare, nisi ipse priùs fuerat sacratus?

Hîc itaque Registrum Cranmerianum appello. Consecrandus in Episcopum Bangoriensem Arthurus Bulkleius anno 1541, commissionem ab Archiepiscopo obtinuit, Johanni Sarisberienſi Episcopo datam, ad *consecrandum et benedicendum Dominum Episcopum electum et confirmatum*:
 “*Accitis,*” inquit, “*vobis aliis quibusvis Episcopis, sive Suffraganeis, executionem officii sui obtinentibus, in numero competenti et requisito, vobis in hujusmodi ministeriis assidentibus, et congruè opitulantibus, vobis tenore præsentium vices nostras committimus, et plenam in Domino concedimus potestatem.*”

Hujus commissionis vigore, die Dominicâ 19 Febr. A.D. 1541, “In Capella infra ædes Venerabilis Viri Johannis Incent LL.D. Decani Ecclesiæ Cathedralis Divi Pauli London., Reverendus Pater Dom. Johannes Sarum Episcopus, assidentibus sibi et comministrantibus Reverendis Patribus, Dominis Re^{mo} Willielmo Menevensi (scilicet Barlovio) et Johanne Gloucestrenſi Episcopis, munus consecrationis et benedictionis Domino Arthuro Bangoriensi electo et confirmato impendebat, in forma Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ solita et consueta, in præsentia mei Anthonii Huse Notarii Publici, &c.”

Hanc consecrationem Archiepiscopus ratam habens, Regi certificavit, eamque Rex suo calculo approbavit. Alias ejusdem consecrationes post sacratum ab illo Parkerum prætereo, in Reverendissimi Archiepiscopi Registro extantes: sufficiat hîc tam claro exemplo, ex actis publicis deprompto, demonstrasse Barlovium alios Episcopos consecrandi jus habuisse (sic enim verba illa Archiepiscopi planè affirmant: “*executionem officii sui*

^s Regist. Cranm. fol. 188.

^t Waræus de Præsulibus Hiberni-

cis, p. 148.

^u Regist. Cranm. fol. 277. 6.

“*obtinētibus*”;) ac proinde illum absque omni dubio fuisse in Episcopum consecratum.

Fuit igitur Barlovius, tum cùm Episcopum hunc Bangorensem sacravit, ipse proculdiao consecratus; ac proinde cum octo post annis ab ^xEdvardo Sexto ab Ecclesia Menevensi ad Wellensem transferretur, nullum Breve *de significavit* ad illum consecrandum emanasse invenitur, quod in omnibus aliis non consecratis pro more illius temporis perpetuò fieri consuevit.

Quod in promotione ejus ad Episcopatum Wellensem factum fuisse diximus, in altera ejus translatione ab Elizabetha ad sedem Cicestrensem adhuc clariùs apparet. ^yUndecim illa graves atque eruditos viros ad varios regni Episcopatus simul eligi curavit. Hos omnes utpote adhuc in ordine tantùm Sacerdotali constitutos, ab Archiepiscopo *confirmari et consecrari* mandavit. Et ex ipsis actis publicis constat hos omnes fuisse confirmatos primùm, ac deinde in Episcopos consecratos. Duos alios antea Episcopos Barlovium atque Scoræum ad Episcopatus Cicestrensem atque Herefordensem electos, *tantùm confirmari* jussit; et ex iisdem actis patet, hos duos *confirmatos solummodo, non consecratos* fuisse.

Quid de libro Brokesii scripserit (Thomas Warde), aut de Episcopis sub Rege Edvardo VI. sacratis, mihi nullatenus est compertum, Id scio, istum, quicquid sit quod scripserit, a Champnæo^z accepisse; qui rem pro solita sua, in hac controversia, fide narrat. . . .

Miraris, vir prudentissime, et meritò miraris, aliquam hujusmodi sententiam (qualem narrat Champnæus) a *Judicibus Regni, sub ipsamet Elizabetha Regina*, ferri potuisse, aut etiam relationem ejus cum permissu publicari. Sed salva res est; neque hïc ego tam falli Champnæum dico, quàm ea retulisse, quæ certò novit falsa omnino fuisse. Primò quippe, ut exinde incipiam, ait, ^z*Judices Regni sub ipsamet Elizabetha Regina* consecrationes *Episcoporum sub Edvardo factas in dubium vocasse*; et unius eorum, *Brookii* nimirum, autoritate, hanc illorum dubitationem confirmat: cùm e contra certissimum sit, venerabilem illum virum mortem obiisse antequam Elizabetha regnare cœpit. ^aTestamentum quippe ejus insinuatum fuit 12 die Octobris an. 1558. Maria autem vixit usque ad 17 diem Novembris proximè sequentis, cui deinde successit Elizabetha.

Secundò, Brookius *in Casibus suis Novellis*, si Champnæo fides, hoc de Elizabethæ *Judicibus* scripsit. At ipse collectionis illius titulus planè ostendit, Brookium illos *Casus Novellos* adeo non collegisse, ut ferè tringinta post obitum ejus annis, ab alio nescio quo authore, ex ejus libro excerpti fuerint. Liber sic inscribitur: *Ascuns Novell Cuses de les ans et temps le Roy*

^x Rymer, vol. 15. p. 169, 70: comp. p. 174.

^y Epist. de Succ. Episc. Angl. p. 18.

[See Courayer's Preface, p. 49.]

^z De Vocatione Ministrorum, p. 432.

^a Wood, Athenæ Oxonienses, Part. I. col. 89.

H. VIII, Ed. VI, et la Roygne Mary, escrie ex La Graund Abridgement, composed per Sir Robert Brooke Chivaler &c. London. 1587.

Atque hinc denique apparet, quomodo tota hæc res se habuerit. D. Robertus Brookius Capitalis Justitiarius fuit sub Regina Maria, vir in legibus nostris eruditus, sed pro ratione illorum temporum, contra Reformatos avitæ religionis propugnator acerrimus. Librum hic utilissimum composuit, post mortem ejus hoc titulo editum; *La Graund Abridgment collect et escrie per le Judge tres reverend Sir Rob. Brooke Chivaler, nudgairs Chiefe Justice del Common Banke.* In illo libro sub certis capitulis totam illam partem Legis nostræ Municipalis digessit, quæ pendet vel a sententiis per Judices latis, vel a responsis et argumentis Jurisprudentum, quæque tum demum vim legis obtinere censentur, cùm nulla lex scripta occurrit, ex qua judicium in causa aliqua ferri possit. Opus laboris maximi, nec minoris utilitatis. Ex hõc corpore juris ab illo collecti Casus Quosdam Novellos excerpit anonymus quidam temporibus Henrici VIII, Edwardi VI, et Mariæ Reginae agitato: et ne de annis, quibus illa quæ ab ipso referuntur, vel discussa, vel judicata fuerint, dubitetur, ad suos quæque Reges et annos regnorum singula retulit. Casus hic allegatus sub Regina Maria collocatur, annoque regni ejus secundo, num. 463, ut verè a Champnæo citatur; qui tamen pro summa sua fide, ad Judices Regni sub Elizabetha Regina eum refert. In illa Collectione nihil de suo profert hujus Compendii author: verba tantùm Brookii exscribit; sed neque ipse Brookius aliud egit, quàm ea literis mandare, quæ in actionibus coram Judicibus Regni, vel ab ipsis decreta fuerant, vel a Jurisconsultis allegata.

Verba Brookii ita se habent: *Dicitur que Evesques in tempore E. 6. ne fueront sacres, et ideo ne fueront Evesques, et ideo lease pur ans per tiels, et confirme per le Deane et Chapter, ne lier^b le successor. Car tiels ne unques fueront Evesques. Contra de Evesque deprive que fuit Evesque in fait tempore dimissionis^c per confirmationem factam. Nota diusitie^d. (2 Mariæ.*

Atque hæc, si Champnæo credamus, fuit Judicum Regni eo tempore sententia. Utinam profectò sic se res habuisset! Invictissimum id nobis præberet argumentum pro consecratione Barlovii tantopere controversâ: Qui cum magnam terrarum partem Episcopatus sui Wellensis alienaverit, tamen neque locationes neque alienationes ejus successor ipsius Bournius (qui in recuperandis Episcopatus sui redditibus sedulam aliàs atque laudabilem operam posuit) in dubium vocavit. Neque credibile est Protectorem Regni Seymerum, cujus usui hæc concessionis factæ fuerint, debitam curam non adhibuisse, ut ab homine fierent, quem certò noverit jus alienandi atque elocandi habuisse.

At verò planè apparet hanc non fuisse Judicum Regni sententiam. Nulla

[^b Both editions of the *Ascens Novell Cases* read *liera* and *et confirmac' fact'*, i. e. *et confirmatio facta*. See p. 131—134 of the

present Work, and the Editor's notes.] [^d Read *diversitie*, i. e. difference; and see the Editor's notes.]

hîc ut in aliis illius relationibus nota occurrit, unde nobis constare possit, vel unum aliquem e Judicibus sic dixisse. Aliter omninò sese exprimit Brookius in iis casibus, ubi *Judicum opiniones*, aut *Curia sententiam* refert. In hîc ipso titulo, *Judicum sententias* a *Jurisperitorum opinionibus* clarè distinguit. Paucis exemplis rem manifestam efficiam. Nota, inquit, per *Tibeh.*^e, *Shelley, et Balduin Justices*, n. 2. per *totam Curiam*, n. 1. per *Tibz.*^f et *Brook Justic.* sic; *Pollard Justice et Brudnel Chief Justice*, contra; n. 13. per *touts les Justices de Banke le Roy*, n. 15. per *opinionem Curia*, n. 18. per *Curiam*, n. 29. *Curia* concessit, n. 30. per *omnes Justitiosarios*, n. 58. per *Hales Justice et plures alios*, n. 62. At verò in casu allegato, præter unicum illud, *Dicitur*, nihil apponitur. Nullum hîc *Curia* judicium, nulla vel *unius Judicis* opinio: etiam hanc rem prorsus indecisam fuisse relictam, ex iis quæ de *Ridleii* locationibus contra eundem *Champnæum* jam observare libet, mihi plusquam verisimile videtur. Illius causa sic se habet.

^eBonnero Episcopatu Londinensi per Commissarios Regios judicialiter amoto, an. 1549, paucis post mensibus *Ridleius Roffensis* Episcopus in ejus locum successit. Mariâ rerum potitâ, ad Episcopatum suum Londinensem restitutus est *Bonnerus*, et sive cupidine vindictæ inflammatus, sive pecuniæ amore abreptus, locationes omnes a prædecessore suo factas, tanquam irritas, et de jure nullas, rescindere conatus est. ^hHac occasione inter *Car* et *Letchmore de Manerio de Bushley* orta lis est, quod priori concesserat *Ridleius*, posteriori *Bonnerus*. De consecratione *Ridleii* in tota actione nulla mentio. In eo causæ momentum constituebatur, quòd *Bonnerus* Episcopatu Londinensi injustè fuerat deprivatus; quòd *Ridleius* tanquam alieni juris invasor amotus fuerat, et *Bonnerus* in integrum restitutus; ac proinde quicquid *Ridleius*, utpote malæ fidei possessor, elocaverat, omni juris vigore destitueretur.

Summâ contentione causa utrinque acta est, *Judicesque* credebantur in *Bonneri* favorem propendere: sed re tandem ad *Curiam Cancellarii* perductâ, ibique rursus auditâ, pro locationibus *Ridleii* decretum est: Et quamvis amici *Bonneri* sedulam operam navarent, ut supremâ *Parliamenti* autoritate concessionem *Ridleii* irritæ pronuntiarentur, nihil obtinuerunt, neque aliquid ampliùs eâ in re factum fuisse comperimus.

Atque hinc patet consecrationem *Ridleii* nullâ sententiâ judiciali in *Foro Civili* (neque enim jam de censuris a Commissariis *Ecclesiasticis* in deprivationibus horum *Episcoporum prolati* agimus) irritam vel habitam vel pronunciatam fuisse. Ad reliquos *Episcopos* quod attinet, illud imprimis certum est, omnes ab *Edwardo VI.* creatos post finem anni 1549, nostro

[^e Quære, *Fitzh.*? see the next note.]

[^f "Read *Fitz.*, i. c. *Fitzherbert.*" *COURAYER*, Defence of the present Work, vol. IV. p. cccxxv.]

^g *Rymer*, vol. 15. p. 222.

^h *Strype*, *Memorials Ecclesiastical and Civil*, vol. 3. p. 57, 58.

saltem more fuisse sacros. Consecrationes eorum, ne uno quidem excepto, in Cranmeri Registro usque ad hunc diem inveniuntur. De modo ac forma qua consecrabantur, satis alibi dictum. Nos utrumque asserimus, neminem scilicet Edvardo regnante ad munus Episcopi absque prævia consecratione fuisse admissum; eorumque consecrationes ritè ac validè factas, neque aliquibus adversantium exceptionibus ullatenus convelli posse.

Quod ad consecrationem Barlovii spectat, jam ostendi quæ fuit legum nostrarum cura, ne quis officium Episcopi usurpet, nisi priùs ad illius exercitium consecratus. Unicam adhuc hujus disciplinæ nostræ confirmationem hîc adjiciam, ut planè perspicias Barlovium haudquaquam potuisse ad Episcopatum Wellensem promoveri, si vel minimus eo tempore scrupulus aliquorum animos subierat, eum non fuisse in Episcopum legitimè sacratum.

Prodiit eo ipso anno quo Barlovius ad Episcopatum Wellensem transferebatur, novum Pontificale Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ, Regia autoritate reformatum. In illo, ante omnia, expressè declaratur, quòd ab ipso Apostolorum ævo semper in Ecclesia fuerant hi tres ordines, Episcoporum, Presbyterorum, et Diaconorum: Quòd hi ordines adeo sacri semper habiti fuerint, ut nemo alicujus eorum officium exercere ausus sit, nisi priùs vocatus, probatus, examinatus, et sic denique per manuum impositionem ad id admissus esset: Ac proinde ab Ecclesia Anglicana requiri, ut nemini qui non antea consecratus fuisset, aliquod horum officiorum exequi liceret, nisi ad id vocetur, probetur, examinetur, et denique formâ in eo libro præscriptâ admittatur. Hoc jus fuit et Regni et Ecclesiæ, cùm Barlovius factus est Episcopus Wellensis. Quis credet ipsi soli hanc prærogativam fuisse concessam, ut absque ulla vocatione, probatione, examinatione, aut admissione, Episcopi officium usurparet? Quisve sanus dixerit eum, si sic fecisset, a nullo mortalium, amico, inimico, fuisse correptum?

End of the Proofs.

[MR. WILLIAMS'S APPENDIX.]

N^o 1.^a

A Paragraph expunged by the Author's direction in the Third Chapter, because he believed the argument not conclusive: there is another inserted in the room of it in p. 62, 63.

2^o. LA liberté que se donnent quelque-fois les Rois d'Angleterre de dispenser de la loi qui défend d'accorder aux Evêques l'investiture du temporel de leurs Evêchez avant leur Consécration, nous empêche de regarder comme démonstratif l'argument qu'on pourroit tirer en faveur de la Consécration de Barlow, de ce que le temporel de l'Evêché de S. David lui a été délivré dès le 26 Avril 1536. Mais comme nous ne trouvons point qu'il ait été sur cela dispensé de la loi commune, on peut du moins tirer de cette concession un argument probable en faveur de sa Consécration. Car il est certain que la loi et l'usage ordinaire d'Angleterre est de ne mettre les Evêques en possession des biens temporels de leur Evêché qu'après leur Consécration. Le Statut passé la 25^e année de Henry VIII. pour régler l'élection des Evêques, qui se trouvera dans nos Preuves^b, le suppose ouvertement. L'auteur de la Police de l'Eglise Anglicane le dit encore bien plus positivement, et marque même dans quel ordre tout se faisoit à l'égard des Evêques, soit pour leur élection, soit pour ce qui la devoit suivre. *Postquam Regis licentia et mandato*, dit cet Auteur, *Episcopi in Angliâ a Decano et Capitulo Cathedralium Ecclesiarum infra Diœceses quibus præficiendi sunt eliguntur, illius assensu electi comprobantur, comprobati confirmantur, confirmati consecrantur, et cùm consecrati homagii juramentum Regi præstiterint, et Rex illis vicissim suorum Episcopatum possessiones restituerit, in ipsâ Republicâ Anglicanâ, non aliquâ a Christo delegatione . . . sed liberâ Principum donatione his honoribus potiuntur.* Polit. Eccles. Ang. cap. 5. p. 39. Il y a dans le Recueil de Rymer cent preuves de ce qu'avance cet Auteur. On y trouve quantité d'Actes d'Investiture, où la Consécration est ordinairement exprimée, ou du moins sous-entendu; et cette riche Collection nous en fournit très peu de la prise de possession du temporel avant la Consécration, ou l'installation, lorsque ce n'étoit qu'une translation. Or nous avons^c l'Acte d'Investiture du temporel de l'Evêché de S. David donné par Henry VIII. à Barlow dès le 26 Avril 1536, où nous voyons le certificat de son installation; et nous ne trouvons point qu'il ait eu sur cela aucune dispense ou aucun privilège du Prince, pour se soustraire à la loi commune. Il y a donc beaucoup d'apparence qu'avant le 26 Avril 1536, il avoit été sacré, comme le supposent Camden,

[^a By Mr. Williams himself, who had omitted the third Article (or "N^o", as he translated it) of the Author's Appendix (see p. 311, note a); these three Extracts

were headed N^{os} IX, X, and XI.]

[^b See p. 304, 305.]

^c Vind. Eccl. Angl. p. 365. [See p. 340.]

Godwin, Wharton, et tous les écrivains qui ont touché quelque chose qui ait rapport à cette histoire.

[To this paragraph should have been added (see p. 62, 63, note o ; and the Editor's note to p. 63, l. 13) the beginning of the next, as follows :

3°. Cet argument, qui seul pourroit ne passer que pour probable, devient tout autrement convaincant, si on le joint au suivant. Car after which followed "c'est un fait constant," &c. as translated p. 63. l. 13.]

N° 2.

The Title of the Fifteenth Chapter was thus in the French Edition.

Suite du même sujet. On fait voir combien les principes rapportez ci-devant ont varié, et l'on examine à quoi on pourroit se réduire, pour avoir une règle certaine de conduite en cette matière.

N° 3.

This following passage the Author has thought fit to expunge, and to insert another in the room of it [p. 275 seqq.], lest he should be thought to espouse Mr. Thorndike's principles about Re-ordination, which he does not.

RIEN n'est moins surprenant, si cette question est regardée comme une question de discipline, comme quelques anciens ont semblé la regarder, et comme d'habiles modernes la regardent encore. Car dans cette hypothèse, comme il n'y a rien de fixe sur cela, et que la discipline varie selon les différentes conjonctures où se trouve l'Eglise, il est aisé de concilier toutes les contradictions apparentes qui se rencontrent ; et l'on n'est point obligé, pour tout rapporter à un système arbitraire, de forcer tous les faits, et de tout entendre dans un sens que la force des termes n'emporte point.

Mais en supposant même que cette question n'appartient point proprement à la discipline, il s'agit de sçavoir, si on ne pourroit point trouver un principe qui servît de règle en cette matière, en sorte qu'on pût à la faveur de cette règle, décider tout d'un coup de la validité ou de l'invalidité d'une Ordination. Or tel est, ce semble, celui, que nous propose un sçavant Théologien Anglois, nommé Herbert Thorndike, dans un livre intitulé : *Origines Ecclesiasticæ*, et qui emporteroit avec lui l'éclaircissement de toutes les difficultez. C'est aux lecteurs à en juger.

Here followed a passage out of Mr. Thorndike ; which I omit, it being already inserted in chap. xv. in its proper place.

Ce passage est un peu long : mais il étoit trop important pour être abrégé, et il mérite bien qu'on y fasse quelques reflexions. 1°. Il suppose avec S. Léon^d, que deux choses sont nécessaires pour la validité de l'ordination, le rit prescrit, soit par J. C., soit, à son défaut, par l'Eglise, et l'autorité de

^d Leo Mag. Ep. 2. inquis. 1. [See p. 276.]

l'Eglise, *auctoritatem ac jus Ecclesiæ—; tum Consecrationis solennitatem*; et cet article ne doit point paroître extraordinaire, puisqu' en effet on ne croit qu'un sacrement conféré dans l'hérésie est valide, que parce qu'on suppose que ce qui se fait dans l'hérésie, est une suite du pouvoir de l'Eglise, que l'erreur ne sauroit suspendre. Mais si la profession de l'erreur ne sauroit suspendre le pouvoir de l'Eglise, l'Eglise elle-même ne peut-elle pas arrêter son propre pouvoir, et ne point reconnoître pour son ouvrage, ce qui se seroit fait hors de son sein? L'auteur le soutient, et je ne sçais par où on pourroit le contester.

2. Si selon l'auteur, ces deux choses sont également nécessaires; comme il est certain que l'omission du rit anéantit le sacrement, le défaut de l'autorité de l'Eglise doit produire le même effet par une conséquence nécessaire; et cela se peut comprendre aisément par la comparaison du mariage, où en vain employe-t-on la matière et la forme, si les loix de l'Eglise et de l'Etat sont violées; puisque par le défaut d'autorité, le mariage est nul, de l'aveu de tous nos théologiens. *Non Deo ritè sacratum videri debet, quod non sit jure Ecclesiæ Deo consecratum, etsi servato ritu Ecclesiæ.*

3. On conçoit ainsi aisément, comment une ordination, d'invalidé qu'elle étoit, peut devenir valide ensuite, sans que rien de sensible y intervienne de nouveau. Car le rit essentiel ayant été administré, l'Eglise qui d'abord, en refusant son consentement, empêchoit que ce sacrement n'eût son effet, levant ensuite cet empêchement par le consentement qu'elle restituë, fait que rien ne manque plus au sacrement pour le rendre valide. *Itaque si dubium existat de auctoritate Ecclesiæ, non de ritu ordinandi, non est mirum, accedente auctoritate Ecclesiæ, valere ordinationem non jure factam, ad id ad quod valere eam vult accedens auctoritas Ecclesiæ.*

4. Rien ne semble plus propre à expliquer tous les faits rapportez ci-dessus, et les variations qu'on a remarquées dans l'Eglise sur cette matière: car dès là qu'on admettra pour principe, que l'autorité de l'Eglise est aussi essentielle à la validité du sacrement, que l'usage de la matière et de la forme, il ne doit point être surprenant que quelques ordinations n'aient point été jugées valides, et qu'on ait reçu les autres; l'Eglise ayant bien voulu par condescendance reconnoître les unes, et ne point admettre les autres par sévérité, ou par des raisons de prudence. *Non est mirum, accedente Ecclesiæ auctoritate, ratas ordinationes evadere eas, quæ non accedente Ecclesiæ auctoritate irritæ erant.* Au contraire, si l'on n'admet ce principe, la conciliation de ces faits est entièrement impossible: *Conciliandorum sibi invicem Ecclesiæ decretorum et gestorum rationem inibimus frustra, hæc repudiat, quærendam.*

5. On lève par ce principe toute l'ambiguïté, et il ne reste plus aucun scrupule; parce que la déclaration de l'Eglise sur le fait des ordinations contestées, décidera tout d'un coup si elles sont valides ou non, et qu'on ne sauroit s'abuser en s'en rapportant à son jugement: *Statuendum est non posse fidelibus fraudi esse ea apud Deum, in quibus sequuntur fidem Ecclesiæ.*

Cela suppose toujours qu'il est certain que la matière et la forme n'ont point été omises ; et en ce cas, on ne peut nier que la règle la plus certaine et la moins équivoque, ne soit de s'en rapporter à l'Eglise.

6. Il est vrai qu'il ne paroît pas que dans l'affaire du baptême des hérétiques on ait raisonné sur ce principe. *Scio aliter decretum esse de baptismo hæreticorum, . . . Sed hoc ad ordinationem trahendum non est ; . . . Non est necesse ratam hæreticorum confirmationem concedere, quorum ratus sit baptismus ; multò minùs ordinationem.* Mais aussi est-il certain que chez les anciens on ne raisonneoit pas toujours de même de ces deux sacremens, et que sur le fait de l'ordination, ils ne se seroient pas écartez de la pensée de l'auteur.

En effet il semble que S. Leon ait remis la validité de l'ordination au bon plaisir et à l'autorité de l'Eglise, comme il le marque dans la lettre à Rustique de Narbonne. *Si qui autem clerici, dit ce grand Pape^f, ab istis pseudo-episcopis in eis Ecclesiis ordinati sunt, qui^g ad proprios Episcopos pertinebant, et ordinatio eorum consensu et judicio præsentium facta est, potest rata haberi, ita ut in ipsis Ecclesiis perseverent. Aliter autem vana habenda est creatio, quæ nec loco fundata est, nec auctore munita.*

C'est là précisément tout le système de l'auteur, et ce n'est que parce que ce principe n'a pas été assez connu, qu'on voit si peu d'uniformité dans tout ce qui concerne cette matière.

Enfin, par ce principe l'Eglise, comme il paroît fort raisonnable, suspendroit ou arrêteroit à son gré le progrès et la succession de toutes les sectes ; puisque le ministère n'ayant point de validité sans son consentement, et aucune secte ne pouvant subsister sans Ministres, le refus qu'elle feroit de donner son consentement pour la validité du Ministère, sapperoit toutes ces sectes par le fondement, et les anéantiroit entièrement.

C'est aux lecteurs à juger si ce principe a autant de solidité qu'il paroît avoir d'avantages ; et s'il est permis de l'adopter, en voyant qu'on ne s'en est jamais servi dans l'Eglise, pour expliquer la difficulté dont il est question. Ce qu'il y a de certain, c'est que tous ceux qui ont contesté la validité de quelques sacremens, ont semblé le supposer : mais les raisonnemens de leurs adversaires en ont toujours supposé un contraire. Au reste, ce qui résulte de tout ceci, c'est qu'il y a eu peu d'uniformité dans l'Eglise sur cette matière ; et que si le principe reçu jusqu'ici dans toutes les Ecoles Catholiques a lieu, on ne peut contester aux Anglois la validité de leur ordination.

J'ajouterai, en finissant, que l'adoption que l'on pourroit faire de cette maxime dans la suite, ne pourroit en rien déroger à la validité des ordinations Anglicanes, qui ont précédé ; parce que ces sortes de maximes n'ont point de pouvoir rétroactif, et que cela ne pourroit avoir lieu que pour la suite, si un Concile Général, ou l'Eglise en corps, s'accommodoit d'un tel principe.

[^e See p. 278.][^f Leo Mag. Ep. 2. inquis. 1. [See p. 278.][^g See p. 278.]

[MR. WILLIAMS'S INDEX^a.]

(Concerning this Index see p. xiii. of the Editor's Introduction.)

AN ALPHABETICAL INDEX.

[It is *alphabetical* only as regards the initial letters: within each letter the order of the pages is followed.]

A.—Abbé Renaudot's Mémoire the cause of this Treatise	-		18
Author's care to advance nothing without proof	-	-	22
Author's only view [in the historical sketch given in the first Chapter] is the English Ordinations	-	-	31
Anthony Kitchin, Bishop of Llandaff, took the oaths	-		40
Abbot, the Archbishop, took pains to convince Fitzherbert	-		47
Archbishop, the present, (Dr. Wake,) very free to give any body admission to examine our Records	-	-	48
Agreed by all [who relate the Lambeth Ordination], that Barlow, Coverdale, and Scory, consecrated Parker	-	-	51
Answers to the reasons urg'd against Barlow	-	-	69
Author of Parker's Life says, that Scory and Barlow needed no Consecration, but were confirmed in their new Bishopricks			78, 79
B.—Bishops [nominal], their power enlarged in Scotland, <i>An. 1572</i>			34
Bruce, a whimsical Scots Presbyterian, against all Ordination, excepting Elections	-	-	ib.
Bishops restored in Scotland	-	-	35
Bishops abolish'd in Scotland	-	-	ib.

[^a This Index is not found in the Bodleian copy: its style however leaves no reasonable doubt as to its author. On the back of the last page is advertised, among other Books printed for W. and J. Innys, J. Osborn, T. Longman, and C. Rivington", Mr. Williams's own Work, viz.:

"The Succession of Protestant Bishops asserted; or the Regularity of the Ordinations of the Church of England justify'd. Wherein the first Protestant Bishops are

"clear'd from the aspersions lately cast upon them by Mr. Thomas Ward, a Romanist, in his Book intituled *The Controversy of Ordination truly stated*, &c. By Daniel Williams, a Presbyterian of the Church of England."

At the bottom of the same page is announced as *in the Press and speedily to be published*, the anonymous translation of the Defence of the present Work, published the same year.]

Bishops ordain'd for Scotland after the Restoration	-	35, 36
Barlow ordain'd Parker at Lambeth	- - -	39
Bluet, one of Champney's authors for his stories	- - -	43
Boner's threats of excommunication ridiculous	- - -	45
Bramhall's Works in the King of France's Library has (<i>sic</i>) a copy in it of our Registers collated [i. e. of the collation of our Registers] with the original	- - -	48
Bishop Bourn not deposed till after the Commission for Parker's Ordination	- - - - -	55
Barlow was consecrated : proofs of it in Chap. iii.	-	58
Boner did not threaten Barlow as [it is said] he did Kitchin	-	59
Bishops cannot sit in Parliament without Consecration	-	63
Barlow not summon'd as Guardian of the Spiritualities, but as Bishop	- - - - -	64
Barlow subscribes as Bishop of St. David's absolutely	-	65
Barlow subscribes to the Institution, &c. [<i>read</i> to the Articles of 1536] before Warton of St. Asaph	- - -	ib.
Barlow present at several Synods as Bishop	- - -	ib.
Barlow one of Arthur Buckley's Consecrators	- - -	65, 66
Barlow, whether he was an Usufructuary only	- - -	70
Bishop of Hereford [Juxon]'s Case the same as Barlow's	-	81
Boner prosecuted by Horn Bishop of Winchester	- - -	116
Boner's Council [Counsel] plead Horn's Ordination null, and he no Bishop	- - - - -	117
C.—Champney's, an insufficient answer to Mason's book	-	17
Ceremonies, none changed in Henry VIII.[s] days	-	31, 32
Ceremonies were alter'd by Edward VI.	- - -	32
Charles II. restor'd [the Anglican] Religion	- - -	33
Cromwell's alteration does not affect the English Hierarchy	-	37
Commission the first for Parker's Ordination, to whom directed	- - -	39
Commission the second, to whom directed	- - -	40
Camden ["no doubt"] drew his account of Parker's Ordination out of the Registers	- - - - -	41
Camden's account agrees with the Journal of Parker's Life	-	42
Champney's account of Parker's Ordination	- - -	42, 43
Champney's inconsistency [<i>rather</i> , Champney's interpretation of Stow's silence in his Chronicle inconsistent with a fact related by that Chronographer in his Description of the Antiquities of London]	- - - - -	53
Cranmer's Registers [Register]; the silence of it is no proof that Barlow wanted Consecration	- - -	60

Cranmer's Register does not mention several others' Consecration as well as Barlow's	- - -	60
Chapter cannot elect without a <i>Congé-de-eslire</i>	- - -	63
Convocations meet [<i>rather</i> , The Convocation of 1536 met] the same time with the Parliament	- - -	65
Canterbury Register proves Barlow one of Buckley's Consecrators	- - - - -	66
Camden says Parker only confirm'd Barlow	- - -	78
Cranmer and Barlow erroneous in matter of Orders	- - -	141
Cranmer and Barlow affirm that Consecration is not necessary, and that Designation only is sufficient	- - -	141, 142
D.—Discipline Presbyterian, when [fully] establish'd in Scotland		34
Durham, the Bishop of, not depos'd until 29th September 1559		54
Durham, the Bishop [of], Moreton's testimony a forgery of the Papists, which he disown'd	- - -	57
E.—Elizabeth, Queen, put things upon the same foot as Edw. VI.		32, 33
F.—Fitzherbert had [or was to have] an account of our Registers from [four Catholics including] three [<i>read two</i> ^b] Jesuits	- - -	47, 48
Forgery commonly the charge of all parties	- - -	49
Forgery in this case [that of the Lambeth Register] a mere chimera		ib.
<i>Fasti Eccles. Anglicanæ</i> : the author of it fixes the time of Barlow's Consecration	- - -	59, 60
Fox's Consecration not in Cranmer's Register	- - -	60, 61
Facts of Barlow's Consecration, in the Appendix	[Art. VIII.]	
G.—Gardiner's Ordination not recorded in Cranmer's Register	- - -	61
H.—Henry the Eight's alterations does not (<i>sic</i>) affect the English Hierarchy	- - - - -	38
Heath, Bishop of York, deposed before [the] date of Parker's Commission	- - - - -	57
Henry VIII's book subscribed by Barlow, and eighteen more Bishops	- - - - -	65
Horn's Ordination valid, and Boner's pretence groundless		130, 131
J.—Journal of Parker's Life, written by himself, gives an account of his Consecration	- - - - -	42
Jesuits, three [<i>read two</i> ^b] of them [together with two other Catholics] examined the Register	- - - - -	47, 48
K.—Knox's Articles of Polity presented to the Assembly of Scotland, <i>Anno</i> 1561	- - - - -	33, 34

[^{b b} See the Editor's Further Notes.]

King, Suffragan of Lincolnshire, his Consecration not mentioned in Cranmer's Register	- - - -	60
L.—Latimer's Consecration not in Cranmer's Register, as well as several others	- - - -	61
Loss of one Instrument, no proof against a Consecration	-	69
Landaff, [the] Bishop [of], named in both [the] Queen's Commissions to consecrate Parker, but endeavours to elude it, observing all the Catholick Bishops resolved to do the same		90
M.—Mason, the first that vindicated the English Ordination	-	17
Mason's Book dedicated to the Archbishop of Paris	-	ib.
Mason's Second Edition in Latin, an answer to all his adversaries [<i>rather</i> , to Champney]	- - -	17, 18
Mary Queen repeal'd all done in Edward's days	- -	32
Mary, Queen, the Succession preserved in [<i>i. e.</i> up to] her time		38
Mandate from Queen Elizabeth, to consecrate Barlow, no proof that he wanted Consecration	- - -	71, &c.
Mandate, the Words of, [a] matter of style: several instances of the like nature with regard to other Bishops	- -	72, &c.
Mandate not justly transcrib'd by Rymer	- -	76, &c.
Morinus proves that the Imposition of hands is the only essential Matter of the Sacrament of Orders	- -	94
N.—Neal [said to have been] sent by Boner, to forbid Kitchin of Landaff to consecrate Parker	- - -	43
Neal makes [<i>rather</i> , said to make] Scory to be Parker's Consecrator		44
Nag's-head story false	- - -	57
Neal, a Man of no note ^c	- - -	ib.
O.—Ordinal [the Anglican] first publish'd in 1549	- -	32
Objections raised against the Record of Parker's Ordination	-	46
Objections of this kind answer'd	- - -	46, &c.
Order that English Bishops be made [<i>rather</i> , Order of proceeding for making Anglican Bishops]	- - -	63, 64
Ordinal [the] new was drawn up by Bishops and Divines, and not by any secular authority	- - -	186, &c.

[^c Merely Bonner's Chaplain, Rector of Thenforth, Regius Professor of Hebrew in the University of Oxford from 1558* to 1569, and an author and Orientalist of distinction; who had also the honour, on the occasion of the Queen's visit to Oxford in Sep. 1566, of receiving her especially marked thanks. For further particulars respecting him, see Wood's *Athenæ Oxonienses*, p. 576, Ed. Bliss, and Dodd's *Church History*, vol. 2, p. 109 a. See also the Editor's note to p. 43 B 1 of the present Work.]

[* The Council wrote Jan. 16. 1558, to the Dean and Chapter of Christ-Church, "to pay to him all such money as was due to him for the reading of the said lecture, and to continue the payment thereof until they should receive further order from thence." Strype's *Annals*, vol. 1. p. 34.]

P.—Parker's Ordination, the history of it	- -	39, &c.
Pole the Cardinal, died a few hours after Queen Mary	- -	39
Parker's Consecration, when perform'd	- -	41
Parker not reproach'd with want of Consecration in his life-time	- - - - -	46
Parker's Ordination not to be tax'd without destroying all Records	- - - - -	49
Proofs for want of positive, the adversaries have recourse to lies	- - - - -	53
Pool of Peterborough, not deposed until after the date of Parker's first Commission	- - - - -	56
Publick Instruments prove nothing against Barlow	- -	69
Parker consecrated eleven Bishops and confirm'd two [the first year of his own Consecration]	- - - - -	78
Parker's Consecration : [the] Bishops of Chichester, Hereford, the Suffragan Bishop of Bedford, and Miles Coverdale, laid their hands on him, and said in English, <i>Take the Holy Ghost</i>	- - - - -	99, 100
Parker's Ordination ought to be judg'd valid	- -	105
Parliament declared all persons ordain'd according to King Edward's Form, were truly Bishops	- -	116, 117
Parliament in 1566 made a solemn Declaration, that Horn and his Colleagues were truly Bishops, and legally ordain'd	- -	130, 131
Parker ordain'd Priest according to the Roman Pontifical before Episcopal Consecration	- - - - -	227
R.—Reformation began in 1533	- - - - -	31
Rebellion against Charles I. destroy'd the [order of things established at the] Reformation	- - - - -	33
Revolution destroy'd [the Anglican] Church Government in Scotland	- - - - -	36
Reformation, the Scots, must not be confounded with the English	- - - - -	36, 37
Registers of Parker's Consecration kept at Lambeth, and at Corpus Christi College at Cambridge	- - - - -	41
Record of Parker's Investiture in Rymer	- - - - -	44
Reasons to prove our Records genuine	- - - - -	49
Registers always the same, tho' quoted differently by mistake	- - - - -	51, 52
Refuge ["Resource"] the last in favour of the fable answer'd	- - - - -	55, &c.
Recapitulation of the whole Treatise in the last Chapter	- - - - -	293, &c.
S.—Scory, one that confirm'd Parker	- - - - -	40, 41
Scory, one of Parker's Consecrators	- - - - -	41

Scory made Parker's principal Consecrator by Neal [<i>rather,</i> according to the story attributed to Neal] - -	44
Sanders says, that Queen Elizabeth had her Bishops consecrated Stapleton's way of reasoning does not imply our Ordination invalid - - - - -	45 52, 53
Stow's silence, no argument against our Ordination -	53
Stow's testimony of no weight, as [to] the deposition of the Bishops ["because he does not say what they would have him say"]	57
Strype fixes [the date of] Barlow's Consecration - -	60
Strype's mistake corrected by the Author - -	61
Strype, a marginal note [of Mr. Williams's] relating to him -	ib.
Sanders says the ancient Canons were observed in Henry VIII[']s time - - - - -	66
Silence of Barlow's want of Consecration when accused of heresy, a proof that he was consecrated - - - - -	68
T.—Thurlby depos'd in July 1559 - - - - -	57
Thorndike's principle to reconcile opposite practices in Ordi- nation - - - - -	275, &c.
V.—Variations among writers about names, no mark of forgery	50
W.—Wake (the present Archbishop)'s answer about our Registers	48, 49
Wharton Henry, an exact writer - - - - -	59
Wharton's testimony of Barlow's Consecration [Confirmation] -	ib.

FURTHER NOTES

BY

THE EDITOR.

(Concerning these Notes see p. xiii of the Editor's Introduction).

TITLE-PAGE.

Justifying] This word is retained by Mr. Williams in its French sense of *proving* or *vouching for*.

Geneviève] Written also *Gèneviève*: also *Geneviève* and *Géneviève*. Mr. Williams's spelling is supported by the *Journal des Sçavans* (Holland Edition: the present Editor has not seen the French one) and our author's "Relation Historique et Apologétique des Sentiments et de la Conduite du Père Le Courayer (*An Historical and Apologetic Relation of the Opinions and Conduct of Father Le Courayer*), Amst. 1729, in two volumes. Also by Hardouin's answer to the present Work, p. 4 of his Preface; and Gervaise's ditto, p. 3.

Translated into English by Daniel Williams] See the Editor's Introduction, p. iii—xiv.

Presbyter &c.] He was one of the Non-juring Clergy.

Etsi hominum &c.] In Optatus the *et* is merely copulative. See p. 247.

MR. WILLIAMS'S ADVERTISEMENT.

With this Advertisement compare pp. iii—xiv, and especially pp. ix—xi, of the Editor's Introduction.

MR. WILLIAMS'S PREFACE.

In this Preface, only the punctuation, orthography, and use of the capitals, have been corrected. The correction of the punctuation will assist, it is hoped, towards the understanding of a style which at best is anything but clear or correct.

Note *a*. "The Succession &c.]" In 8vo. pp. 156 + xx. (See more in the Editor's first foot-note to Mr. Williams's Index, p. 369.) There are copies in the Bodleian, Christ Church, and Exeter College Libraries.

Page 6 C (i. e. paragraph 3), line 5. the author of the *Nouvelles Littéraires*] Father *Des-Molets*, who reviewed the present Work Dec. 1723. See more in the Editor's Introd., p. xix.

6 C 6. the compiler of the *Journal des Sçavans*] By publishing favourable *Extraits*, or Reviews, in Jan. and Feb. 1724. See more in the Editor's Introd., p. xix, xx.

6 C 8. M. l' Abbé Des Fontaines] In both Mr. Williams's Editions it was printed *M. l' Abbe Fontaine*. The right reading is given by our author in the "Relation &c.": see p. xix, xx of the Editor's Introd.

6 D 2. Father Le Quien] In both Mr. Williams's Editions this name is wrongly given as *Le Quin*. See more in the Editor's Introd., p. xxiv, xxvi, &c.

7 B 1. this learned gentleman] I. e. Father Le Quien.

8, 5. this] I. e. such commendation.

10 A. This statement is confirmed by our author himself, in his "Relation &c." vol. 1. p. 16, where, referring to what he had said of Mr. Thorndike's system, he writes, "je réformai tout cet endroit dans la traduction Angloise;" *I reformed this whole passage in the English translation.* Also in his two Letters to M. l'Abbé Des Fontaines (see p. 6 C 8. and its note), dated Jan. 12. and Feb. 5. 1724, inserted in the Journal des Sçavans the April (in the Holland Edition, the May) following, and reprinted by our author in the "Relation &c." (vol. 2. p. 24—35) from (p. 509 seq. of) the Holland Edition, in both of which he explains his meaning as to this part of his Work, denying any intention of adopting Mr. Thorndike's sentiments, and in the first (p. 27, 28), the more entirely to prevent mistake on this head, makes (in substance at least) the same alteration in the title of the 15th chapter as Mr. Williams has given. See more in the Editor's Introd., p. iii—xiv.

10 B 8. and inserted the original at the bottom of the page] This however he or his printer has frequently forgotten to do: leaving to the present Editor the business of transcribing and inserting both these and other more important omissions. See more in the Editor's Introd., p. xii.

LETTRE DE L' AUTEUR AU TRADUCTEUR (p. 11—13).

In both Mr. Williams's Editions this Letter was wretchedly printed:—not to insist on the orthography, or the superfluous and omitted accents, there were no less than *nine* grammatical blunders, one of which affected the sense also. At the end of our author's Defence of his present Work, he has himself published a more correct copy, which has been followed in the present Edition wherever its readings appeared preferable. Not however that the above blunders were of a nature to require the authority of any second copy for their correction; but so it was, that of the above *nine*, all but one were absent from that copy.—The spelling (which even in this better copy was far from correct) has been rectified, and the accents supplied, according to modern usage, except where the orthography of the "Dissertation" was observed to differ from that usage. From this statement, however, must be excepted the plural terminations in *és*, which ought on the same principle to have continued to be represented by *ez*. In the Letter itself, indeed, not the plurals in *és* only, but both singular and plural nouns in *ès* also, were spelt in both copies with *ez*; a mode of orthography found also in other writings of our author's.

TRANSLATION OF THE LETTER (p. 14—16).

The translation, besides amending the punctuation, &c., has been carefully compared and made to agree with the original; by which, with a few further alterations, the style has at the same time been made considerably clearer and more correct. In all, those corrections which contributed (more or less) to accuracy of rendering, and were not made for the sake of the style alone, were little short of *fifty*.

For Mr. Williams's renderings "Indeed", p. 14, 11, and "the rabble", p. 14, 22, read "In fact" and "the multitude".—For "the Church of England", p. 15 B 15, and p. 16, 1, read "the Anglican Church": see the note to p. 17 B 15, &c.

In Mr. Williams's Editions the translations and original are printed on opposite

pages, the former to the left, the latter to the right. This however would not have been convenient in the present Edition.

The real value of this testimonial, as implying any sort of correctness in either of Mr. Williams's Editions, has been sufficiently explained in the Editor's Preface.

THE AUTHOR'S PREFACE.

P. 17 B (i. e. paragraph 2), l. 6. *A Defence &c.*] The title of the posthumous Latin Edition of 1625 (see line 11 with the Editor's note) was *Vindiciæ Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ*; that of the preceding English Edition, published at London in 1613, "Of the Consecration of the Bishops in the Church of England:" &c.—From the same author we have also "The Vindication of the Ordination of the Ministers of the Reformed Churches beyond the Seas" &c. Oxford, 1641.

17 B 11. by one of his friends] Not by one of his friends, but by himself: see the title, and the beginnings both of the Editor's Dedication and of the author's own to the Bp of Paris (which follows one to James I). This enlarged Latin Edition was translated back into English by Lindsay, and so published again in 1728, together with a fac-simile reprint of the Ordination Service of 1549 as printed by Grafton, an English translation of the fragments of Latin letters to our author which make Art. 9 of the Proofs at the end of the present Work, an Index, a Preface including lists of the modern Anglican Succession, foot-notes, and a sermon of the author's.

17 B 15, 18 B 4, &c. &c. the Church of England] Quotations from Anglican writers excepted, read everywhere "the Anglican Church"; the original having always "l' Eglise Angliane". Even this expression, our author was privately advised by one of his distinguished friends to abstain from, *Rel. vol. 1, p. 35* (vol. 2, p. 45, 46); while Hardouin (in the 8th leaf of his Preface) declares plainly that he will never say the Anglican *Church*, "although this author always says "so," but sometimes the Anglican *Nation*, sometimes the Anglican *Sect*."

18 C 5. a Work &c.] The Editor has not been able to see this Work.

18 C 6. The Doctor, who] Read "the Doctor who".

19 B 13. *De Vera &c.*] This Work also the Editor has been unable to meet with.

20 B 13. Read (according to a correction at the end of the French Edition), "and peace return, to the advantage of truth and charity."

21, 3. Omit "also", and for "Cromwell;" read "Cromwell,".

22 B 4. are my vouchers for] Read "answer for".

24 B 1. the reasons that have retarded &c. See the Editor's Introduction, p. xvii, xviii.

24 C 1. Omit the word "But".

MÉMOIRE OF RENAUDOT.

25, 1. that the surest way &c.] This insertion appears in the French Edition.

25, 8. and is it not known that Queen Elizabeth &c.?] This story about Creagh, as our author has shewn in book 2. chap. 2. of his *Defence* of the present Work, (vol. 1. p. 254—261 of the original French, vol. 1. p. 157—161 of the English translation) is altogether inconsistent with facts. At the time of Elizabeth's accession the See of Armagh was vacant, Dowdale having died at

London, Aug. 10. 1558. The next Roman Catholic Archbishop was Donat O'Teig, who appears to have been consecrated at Rome in February, 1560, but who certainly did not return to England till the latter end of that year, i. e. not till a year after the Consecration of Parker. O'Teig died in 1562, and it was to him that Richard Creagh succeeded as the next Roman Catholic Archbishop, having been consecrated at Rome in the year 1563, i. e. not till the *fourth* year after the Consecration of Parker. One Roman Catholic account indeed makes it even later, i. e. in 1564, but this appears certainly to be a mistake. His first committal to the Tower, which was on his return from Rome, did not take place till Feb. 22. 1564, i. e. not till the *fifth* year after the Consecration of Parker.

Richard Creagh "died in the year 1585 (as it is said) in the Tower of London, "having been imprisoned there by the State." *Ware's Writers of Ireland, B. 1, p. 97 Ed. Harris*, as quoted by Haddan in his invaluable Edition (for the Anglo-Catholic Library) of Bramhall's *Consecration &c. of Protestant Bps*, p. 47, note e: see also the other authorities there referred to.

25 B 3. For "wished to have him consecrated" read "chosen to be crowned".

A DISERTATION ON THE VALIDITY OF THE ORDINATIONS OF THE ENGLISH*, &c.

CHAPTER I.

P. 31 A (i. e. parag. 1). Add as a side-title "Separation of Henry VIII."

31 B. Add as a side-title "Changes in England."

32 and 33. The running title should be: "Historical account of the changes "in the English Ordinations."

32, (note) c. By "Statutes at Large, vol. 1." our author means the Edition of the Statutes at Large to the year 1680, which was published at London in 1681 by John Keble, Esq., of Gray's Inn.

32 B 4. in 1549] It was ordered by the Parliament which sat from Nov. 4. 1549 to Feb. 1. 15⁴⁹/₅₀, in the 12th of the 24 Chapters of that Session, to be drawn up and set forth before the 1st of April following; and was printed by Grafton in 'March 1549', i. e. before Lady Day 15⁴⁹/₅₀.

32 f. *Vol.* (or *Part*) 2. begins with Mary's Reign and lasts to the end of the Work. In part, perhaps, of the Edition, the numbering of the pages was carried straight through.

33 i. *History &c.*] Written by Laud himself: published by Henry Wharton, London, 169³/₄.

33 B 4. in the House of Lords] It passed both Houses, and was presented to the King on Candlemas Day, and, though it did not receive the Royal sanction, was acted on, and is referred to in a subsequent Ordinance of both Houses of the 12th of June the same year. Collier, vol. 2. p. 822, 823.

33 C 7, and 34 3. *Ministers*] In the French *Prêtres*. It is clear from the authorities referred to, that what in the Articles of 1561 are called "Ministers" (Spotswood p. 152—174),—in those of 1578—81 (chap. 4: compare c. 2) "Pastors,

* So this title should be corrected: see p. lxxviii.

“Bishops, or Ministers” (Spots. p. 292, comp. p. 291. and Calderwood, p. 105, comp. p. 104), are intended. It may be observed that the Book of Discipline of 1578—81 (chap. 2) mentions a 4th Office, viz. that of *Doctors* (Spots. p. 291. Cald. p. 104), whose especial business was to teach doctrine “simply, without such applications as the Ministers use”, under which Office were comprehended also Academic teachers: see chap. 5: (Spots. p. 293. Cald. p. 106.) Also that Superintendents, as well as Exhorters and Readers, appear to have been considered as mere temporary Officers, arising out of the necessity of the times: see Spots. p. 158 and 156, and Cald. p. 25, 26.

34, 1. drawn up by John Knox.] In the Commission were named also “Mr. John Winram, Mr. John Spotswood, Mr. John Row, ^aJohn Willock, and Mr. John Douglas.” Calderwood p. 24. We are told however by Spotswood that “it (the Policy) had been drawn up by John Knox”. History &c. p. 173.

34, 2. Election and Ordination] “Election, Examination, and Admission” is the language of the Articles themselves. Spotswood, p. 154.

34 B 2. the power of the Bishops] I. e. of the Superintendents. See p. 33 C.

34 B 13. retained the name of Bishops] They would not, however, allow that “properly taken”, the word meant any thing distinct from ordinary Ministers: see the note to p. 33 C 7 and 34. 3, together with chap. 11 of the Book of Discipline (Spotswood, p. 299, and Calderwood, p. 112.)

34 B 15. for the Election of the Ministers] In the document itself (Spotswood, p. 292. c. 3. § 11, 12) it is called *Ordination*.

34 B 16. be subject to the Presbytery] “Presbyteries” in the plural is the expression of Spotswood in the passage quoted, “Elderships” that of Calderwood. Compare the rules for *Superintendents* in the Book of Discipline of 1561, by which each such Officer is required to “be subject to the censure and correction of the Ministers and Elders of his Chief Town and whole Province over which he is appointed.” Spotswood, p. 160; Calderwood, p. 27.

35 B 9. the Bishop of Ely] Bishop Andrewes.

35 C 3. In the Assemblies &c.] In the Assembly of Glasgow, Nov. 21. 1638 (Collier, vol. 2. p. 784); in the Assembly of Edinburgh, Aug. 12. 1639; and in the Parliament, Aug. 31. 1639: (Collier, vol. 2. p. 788.)

36 z. A complete &c.] The full title of this work is “A Complete History of England, with the Lives of all the Kings and Queens thereof,” to the death of William III “by a learned and impartial hand”. In three volumes, folio: London, 1706.

37, 12. having led to no succession] Our author seems not to have been aware of the existence even of that remnant of the Anglican Church in Scotland, which, in spite of the determined opposition of the Presbyterians, has since regained so considerable a position among the religious communities of that country.

CHAPTER II.

39, 1. Queen Mary] She died Nov. 17. 1558.

39 C 4 by way of *compromise*] See the process of his Election in the Extract from his Register mentioned in the note to p. 41, 3 and 9. *Compromise* is one

^a The omission of the “Mr.” is probably a mere misprint, the more as the preceding words “Mr. John Row,” are the conclusion of a line.

of the three ways of Election, by which the Chapter appoint one of their number (in Parker's case, the Dean) as their *Compromissary*, to choose under certain laws and conditions for the whole, they promising jointly to accept and ratify his Election so made. Life of Parker, p. 52.

40, 2. Barlow] In Rymer, *Barlo*.

40 B 3. Barlow] In Rymer, *Barlowe*.

40 B 15. *Supplentes &c.*] Add as a foot-note:—[Translated, p. 136.]

41, 3. in Abp Bramhall's Works] In an Appendix added by the Editor (John Vesey Bp of Limerick, afterwards, i. e. from 1679 to 1716, Abp of Tuam) containing, 1. a long Extract from the Register of the See of Canterbury, occupying pp. 1022—1050, and 2. a copy of the Cambridge MS. referred to in the following paragraph of the text, occupying (with the certificates of its accuracy) three pages more.

The whole is in four "tomes" (Dublin 1674—7) but with only one numbering of the pages, the second tome beginning with p. 491, the third with p. 645, the fourth with p. 905. Our author having begun with naming only the page, the same plan has been continued throughout this Edition; but from this note the reader will easily understand to which vol. any given page belongs.

41 B 4. in Bramhall's Works] I. e. in the Appendix which has just been mentioned.

43 B 1. one named Thomas Bluet] Champney speaks of him as "a venerable Priest", and "a grave, learned, and sensible man" ("viro gravi, erudito, ac prudenti"). Cap. xiv. p. 498.

Concerning Neal (or Neale), whom our author calls "an officer of Bishop Bonner's" (compare also p. 44 D. 6, 7 and p. 57 B 10) see the truth in the Editor's foot-note to Mr. Williams's Index (p. 372).—It may be added that Champney (p. 498) appears to have supposed erroneously that he had ceased to be Professor of Hebrew at Oxford at the time in question, speaking of him as "a most respectable (*honestissimo*) and most learned man, formerly (*olim*) Professor of Hebrew in the University of Oxford, but at the time when these things took place, of the domestic circle (*ex familiaribus*) of Bonner Bishop of London." Both Mason (Vind. Eccl. Angl. p. 341) and Bramhall (Works, p. 461) make their adversaries suppose him to have gone up from Oxford for the purpose alleged.

According to Wood he was "an able theologian, and admirably well skilled in the Greek and Hebrew languages"; but "his religion being more Catholic than Protestant", and himself "always dreading his being called into question", he ultimately resigned his Professorship, and "spent the remainder of his days in study and devotion",—chiefly at Cassington, a village about four miles N.W. of Oxford, where also he caused a brass inscription to be put up for him in the Church, A.D. 1590, being then 71 years of age. From Dodd's Church History, however, we learn that "the Records of the English College at Douay and Rheims give an account that one Thomas Neal, an ancient Clergyman who had suffered much in prison in England, arrived at Douay June 1. 1578, and returned again into England Jan. 7. 1580." The opposers of the Nag's-head Story, it may be further observed, have been sadly ignorant of the real character and position of Neale; to which ignorance must in charity be attributed the contemptuous manner in which they have thought proper to speak of him. Since

however it is altogether improbable either that Neale should have invented and circulated a deliberate falsehood, or that, if he had really related what is alleged, it should not have been noticed publicly, till more than forty years afterwards, the most natural conclusion is, that at the most some statement or observation of Neale's, if not altogether misunderstood at the time, was at all events so incorrectly transmitted afterwards, as in the end to have given rise to the fable in question.

44 B 8—10. In the additional Errata given at the end of the Defence of the present Work (which were forgotten at the time of printing this sheet) the author directs the following alterations: 1. For *Five more* read *four more*. 2. Omit *two on the second of March*. 3. For *and two* read *and three*.—The reason for omitting the two Bishops consecrated on the second of March is that they belonged to the Province of York, for which same reason they are not mentioned in the Latin Life of Parker given at the end of Strype's Life of him: they were consecrated moreover in 1569, not 1568. His authority for giving the others as *four and three* instead of *five and two* he ought certainly to have given as a note: it is however the Register itself^b; and the origin of the mistake the Table which is mentioned p. 78, and which misled Strype.—It may be added that the four Bishops consecrated Jan. 21 were Jewel, Bullingham, Young, and Davies; the three consecrated Mar. 24, Gest, Bentham, and Barclay.

44 B 12 and 15. false] I. e. forged, counterfeit, as indeed it might as well have been rendered. And so in several other places.

44 B 15. public] Read "the public".

44 D 6. unknown persons] See the note to p. 43 B 1.

47 C 5. three whereof] Read "two whereof", according to the additional Errata at the end of the Defence of the present Work.

48 B 7. The Abp of Canterbury] Dr. Wake.

51 D 2. Bramhall] Not Bramhall himself, but his Editor after his death. See the note to p. 41, 3.

52 D 11. Of Stapleton Bramhall says: "We look upon Dr. Stapleton as one of the most rational heads that your Church hath had since the separation." P. 464.

53 u. Quis nescit, &c.] This Latin (given by our author in the text) was omitted by Williams.

53 B 7. says he] Our author must not be understood as quoting the exact expressions of Champney. His words are: "Hujus vero silentii, omnibus bene ponderatis, alia probabilis ratio allegari nequit, nisi quia odium et indignationem, veritatem dicendo, sibi parere timuerit." *But of this silence, all things well weighed, no other probable account can be given, than that he was afraid to bring upon himself hatred and indignation by telling the truth.*

54, 12. by Parker] In the passage cited, Stow does not say who consecrated Grindal.

57 B 10. an unknown person like Neal] Compare p. 43 B. 1, 2 and 44 D. 6, 7; but see the truth in the Editor's foot-notes to Mr. Williams's Index (p. 372).

^b For this and other kind information the present Editor is indebted to the Rev. A. W. Haddan, M.A. Fellow and Tutor of Trin. Coll. Oxford, the learned and indefatigable Editor of the Anglo-Catholic

Library Edition of Bramhall's Works, who has certainly spared no pains in the examination as well of original documents as of every other source of historical knowledge.

CHAPTER III.

59 D 7. For "really" read "it is true."

60 B 4. there are many others] Mason, in the passage referred to, speaks only of Gardiner. See however the Editor's Preface to vol. 3 of the Anglo-Catholic Library Edition of Bramhall's Works.

60 B 14. Suffragan Bishop of Lincoln] It should have been "Suffragan to the Bishop of Lincoln", as Strype has it. (See the note to p. 72 D 4.)

60 B 15. in 1541] This is altogether a mistake, into which our author has inadvertently followed Strype, although Strype himself is corrected by Wharton in p. 258 of the Appendix to Strype's Work itself. Robert King, "first a monk of Rewley, a Priory without Oxford, of the Cistercian order,—then Abbot of Bruerne in Oxfordshire,—after Abbot of Thame, of which he was also called Bishop,—and lastly of Osney" (Strype p. 95), was indeed made the first Bishop of Oxford in the year 1542 (not 1541), but being already Suffragan to the Bishop of Lincoln (*ibid.*), had of course been consecrated before; and not only so, but the Bishopric of Oxford being one of the new foundations, it appears that he was not required even to be confirmed, but was simply put into possession by the same Royal Letters Patent by which the See itself was created, which Letters Patent, bearing date Sep. 1. 1542, are given in Rymer (vol. 14. p. 754). In these he is called "*Episcopus Rovensis*", a mistake, apparently, for *Bovensis*, by which title he is mentioned in Wharton's list (see the note to p. 72 D 4), unless the reader should prefer translating "*a roving Bishop*"! Strype in the place quoted calls him "*Titular Bishop Reonen[is]*", and in p. 37 says that he resigned Osney and Thame under that title; having however stated previously (p. 36, where he refers to the Register of Abp Courtney), that while Abbot of Osney he "was consecrated Titular Bishop, and called *Episcopus Roannensis*, a See in the Province of the Archbishopric of Athens". So Godwin: "Dum illi (Osneiensi) Cœnobio Abbas præset, umbratilem Episcopatum adeptus, Archiepiscopo Atheniensi (si diis placet) Suffraganeus in Episcopum consecratus fuerat". *Whilst he presided as Abbot over that Abbey (the Abbey of Osney) having obtained a shadowy Bishopric, he had been consecrated Bishop as a Suffragan (if it please the gods) to the Archbishop of Athens.* De Præsulibus Angliæ, p. 587. He died in 1557 (Strype, p. 95).—Compare the note to p. 72 D 4.

61 C 4. and 62, 7. on the twenty-sixth of September 1535] This is a mistake. Strype in the page referred to dates the Act of Confirmation and Election of Fox and Barlow on the 15th of Sept.^c, but with respect to their Consecration says only, that it was "not inserted in the Register".

^c Strype himself in the Preface to vol. 3 of his Annals, where he notices both our author's correction and Mr. Williams's attack (p. 61, note *i*), denies that he has united Fox and Barlow under one date, but it is impossible for any man of common sense to read the passage, even as he has himself *silently altered the punctuation and type in copying it* (" : And" instead of ", and", as it really stood), and question for a moment what his words at least *ought* to mean. It may be added that a

misprint in both Mr. Williams's Editions, viz. the want of a stop between "dispassionate author" and "D. W.", led Strype (apparently) to suppose that the criticism in the text was Mr. Williams's own, and the note some other person's.—Also, that Sep. 15 is the right date for the Confirmation and Sep. 26 for the Consecration of Fox, as appears in the former case from the Archiepiscopal, in the latter from the Diocesan Register.

62 B 11. That — if any &c.] This passage is given in Latin by our author, who nevertheless refers to the same page of the Statutes at Large from which it is here printed in English.

63 B 1. In short,] This connecting phrase does not seem very suitable; but as it is not till the following words “it is an indisputable fact, &c.” that the published French of Courayer is resumed, the natural presumption is that the words “In short,” are translated (like the preceding paragraph) from the private corrections Mr. Williams professes to have received from the author; and as he has not furnished us with his French original, we have no alternative but to leave his translation as we find it, however small our confidence in its correctness.

63 C 5. The Dean of the Arches never confirms &c.] This will be best explained by the passage immediately preceding this present quotation, a passage well worth transcribing on its own account:—

“The first thing necessary to obtain a Bishoprick in England is the King’s *Congé d’eslire*: that appears in the Rolls. Next the actual Election: that appears in the Records of the Dean and Chapter. Thirdly, the King’s Acceptation of the Election, and his Commission to the Archbishop, or four Bishops in the vacancy, to confirm the Election, and consecrate the person elected and confirmed legally: that appears in the Letters Patents enrolled. Fourthly, the Confirmation of the Election before the Dean of the Arches, but by the Archbishop’s appointment: (this is performed always in Bow Church, except extraordinarily it be performed elsewhere by Commission:) this appears in the Records of the Archbishop. Fifthly, the Consecration it self by the Archbishop and other Bishops, or other Bishops without him by virtue of his Commission: this appears in the Records of the Protonotary of the Sec of Canterbury. Lastly, the Restitution of the Temporalities^d, which appears in the Rolls, and his Enthronisation, in the Records of the Dean and Chapter. Every one of these takes another by the hand, and he who will enjoy a Bishoprick in England must have them all.” Bramhall, pp. 481, 482.

64, 13. Daniel Pulteney, Esq.] He was cousin to the celebrated statesman William Pulteney, who in July 1742 was created Baron of Heydon, Viscount Pulteney, and Earl of Bath. In the beginning of the reign of George II. he was (under his cousin) a leading member of the Whig part of the Opposition which finally drove Walpole from the helm. William Pulteney having died without issue July 7. 1764, Daniel’s daughter’s daughter (whose father had in the mean time succeeded to the Scotch Baronetage of his family) was afterwards “created Baroness Pulteney, July 21st, 1791, and Countess of Bath, Oct. 4th, 1803. But [she too] dying without issue in July 1808, the titles again became extinct.” Collins’s Peerage, vol. V. 657, and IX. 414.

65, 1. Mason adds] From “the Journal Book.” He states also that in the same Book he is mentioned, and was therefore consecrated, before the Bishop of St. Asaph: (see the next paragraph.) Compare the Parliamentary Writ given in the Appendix, Art. VIII. No. 4. (p. 341.)

65 z, col. 2. Read “before him, the present Editor has felt”].

65 c. See p. 355, 356.

66, 20. After “*canonum*” add, [“in imitation of the ancient canons”].

^d In the Anglo-Catholic Library Edition (vol. 3, p. 157) *Temporalities*.

CHAPTER IV.

70 C 1. But, says Champney, &c.] These must not be understood to be Champney's own expressions, at least not in the passage referred to.

72 D 4. and of (*omit of*) Sidon.] Before the Act (26 Henry VIII. c. 14) for appointing twenty-six Suffragans in the several Dioceses of England and Wales which mentions itself that such had before "been accustomed to be had", the titles of such Suffragan or Titular Bishops were almost always nominal, such as those now conferred by the Church of Rome. A few of these previous Suffragans are enumerated in Strype's Memorials of Cranmer, p. 36, 37, as corrected by Wharton in the Appendix, p. 255—258^e, viz. 1. *Underwood*, Suffragan in Norwich, about 1531. 2. *Thomas Wellys*, Prior of St. Gregory's by Canterbury, *Bishop of Sidon*, and Suffragan to Abp Warham. He was Suffragan at the opening of St. Dunstan's tomb in April 1508, and survived the year 1511. 3. Christopher *Bishop of Sidon*, who, according to Strype assisted Cranmer in Ordinations, but according to Wharton "was not Suffragan to the Abps of "Canterbury"^f. 4. *Thomas Bishop of Sidon*, and Suffragan to the Bishop of London, in the time of Cranmer.—As for *William Bottlesham*, "*Episcopus Navatensis*", who was at the Convocation in 1382, the word *Navatensis* is, it seems, a mere blunder for *Landavensis*,—or perhaps, which is the same thing (see the Life of Parker, App. p. 154), *Tavensis*. 5. *Robert King*, concerning whom see the note to p. 60 B 15. 6. *John Hatton*, "*Episcopus Negropont.*" 7. *John Thornton*^g, Prior of Dover, "*Episcopus Syrinensis*", and Suffragan to Abp Warham, in whose time he died. He was the last of the seven Suffragans of the Diocese of Canterbury consecrated before Cranmer's time. 8. A "*Bishop of Hippolitanum*"^h, who assisted Abp Cranmer at his Ordinations. 9. *Richard Martin*, Guardian of the Grey Friars at Canterbury, &c., who in his Will, dated 1498, styles himself "*Bishop of the Universal Church*".—These however are but a few out of many. A copious and regular catalogue from Wharton's MSS is printed (after some other papers on the subject) in vol. 6 of Nichols's *Bibliotheca Topographica Britannica*.—Even the Henrician Suffragans were neither required, nor made it a practice, until after the second Act on the subject, to take their titles from the particular Diocese in which they were to officiate, but only from some one of the 26 towns named by Parliament. See Wharton's note in Strype's Appendix, p. 256.

74 C 6. as the author of Whitgift's Life observes] This is a mistake: Strype (on the page referred to) records the fact of the Confirmation, but without note or comment.

^e See note *g* below.

^f This Christopher does not appear to be contained in Wharton's list (see the latter part of the note).

^g In p. 111, 120, 121, 304, and other places,—although not in p. 62,—Strype has confounded this *John Thornton* with *Richard Thornden*, Monk of Christ Church, Canterbury, who at the dissolution of that Monastery in 1539 or 1540, was made first Prebendary of the College of Secular Canons substituted for it, and soon after

succeeded Richard Yngworth (consecrated Dec. 1537) as second Henrician Suffragan of the Diocese, and Bishop of Dover, in which office he continued till his death, in the last year of Mary. See Wharton's Observations on Strype's Memorials, communicated to and published by Strype himself, Appendix, p. 258: compare also p. 255 and 257.

^h Which according to Wharton is *Hippo*, but Cranmer's Register appears to have *Johannes Hipolitanensis*.

77 C 2. whom some believe to have been Parker himself] “The probability seems to be, that the *actual composition* of the book was the work of John Jocelyn the Archbishop’s Secretary, the collections for it being made by Jocelyn, Dr. Yale (the Abp’s Chancellor), Ackworth (Public Orator at Cambridge, and Chancellor of Winchester, but afterwards one of the Abp’s antiquaries), and others, the whole being carried on under the superintendence of the Abp, and the book printed at Lambeth, although with the types of Day the Queen’s printer.” Haddan, note *d* to p. 12 of the Anglo-Catholic Library Edition of Bramhall’s Consecration of Protestant Bishops; where may be seen also references to the authorities for both sides of the question.

77 C 3. was published first at London in the year 1572.] Properly speaking it was not published at all, having been printed for private circulation only, at the Abp’s press at Lambeth in the years 1572, 3, 4, and with great variety in the different copies, which according to Baud (who writes in 1603) were only fifty: in Drake’s time (1729) only 21 were to be found (see the present Editor’s *Introd.* p. xxxvii). It was reprinted at Hanau (*Hanovia*) in 1605, from the worst and most defective copy, says Drake, of all he had examined. In 1729 it was edited with great care and in a very handsome form by Drake himself (Sam. Drake, D.D. Fellow of St. John’s Coll. Camb., and Rector of Treeton, Yorkshire. See more in Haddan’s note *c* to p. 11 of the above Work, on which page, however, his side-note [Hanover.] should be [Hanau.]

78, 2 with note *o.*] Concerning this extract see the note to p. 44 B 8—10.

80 k. Champney’s next words however are “*nisi forsā melius ac veriūs dice-remus, neque etiam istos tunc consecratos fuisse, quod plus veritatis in se videtur habere*”: *unless perhaps it would be better and truer to say, that not these either had then been consecrated, which seems to have more truth in it.*

81 B 22. *in Episcopum ibidem Electi*] In the French, and in both Mr. Williams’s Editions, it is printed *Electum*.

82, 1. *Assavensis*] For this Mr. Williams has *Menevensis*, which is clearly wrong.

82 a. The instances given by the author, together with those which the Editor has added within brackets, are (if he mistakes not) all the Instruments of Investiture which occur between p. 487 and p. 716.

83 B 11. If the thing was unknown] I. e. his Consecration.

84 b. For “vol. 1. Appendix, p. 287. [p. 184. Ed. 1721,] and” read “vol. 1, p. 287 and Appendix, p. 184, 5 (Ed. 1721). Also”.

85 B 14. a learned Englishman] Archbishop Wake.

85 C 9. and that one] Omit *that*.

CHAPTER V.

86 D. For the side-title “Neal’s story.” read “Neale’s alleged story.”

CHAPTER VI.

94, 15. Durandus.] Or *Durantus*. So in Martene and the Bodleian Catalogue.

94 B 3. among the Greeks] To these words should have been added (together with the present Editor’s addition in brackets at the end), the following footnote of Mr. Williams’s, which is found only in his Second Edition (compare his Advertisement, p. 2):—

This passage is otherwise printed in the original than it is here translated: it is in the original *que chez les Grecs*, "but among the Greeks": whereas the word *que* is not in the author's MSS. and the fault was the printer's, as the author has been pleased to signify to me in a letter dated June 3. 1724. D. W. [Besides the omission of *que*, the author afterwards (in the year 1726), in the additional Errata given at the end of his Defence of his present Work (vol. 4, p. ccxxxiii) directed the word *point* to be inserted after *n'a* in the preceding words *et n'a été en usage*; a correction however which concerns only the style. ED.]

95 g. *Neque in hoc scandalizamus*] These words, which our author here joins with what follows after,—in the quotation on p. 97, he has attached to what goes before. It must be observed, however, that what follows after is but a kind of paraphrase of what goes before; so that what applies to one applies to the other also, and that these words are so suspended between the two, that they may be construed with either or both.

97 l. See the note to p. 95 g.

100, 2. *authoritate*] So our author has rightly corrected the reading of the Cambridge Record, as published by Burnet, and at the end of Bramhall's Works (p. 1051, &c.), viz. *antedicti*, from the parallel passage of the Record in the Register at Canterbury, which is also published at the end of Bramhall's Works, p. 1044—1047.

CHAPTER VII.

108 B 17—19. "or in public—omitted", and in note c, col. 2, l. 2—5 "aut—soleant"] This has been inserted from Morinus, instead of the marks of omission which our author and Mr. Williams had given.

110 C—112 A. The quotations from the Anglican Ordinal are given by Mr. Williams from Grafton's Edition of 1549, retaining the old spelling and form of the words. In the present Edition the Edition of Cardwell has been followed. See however the notes to the Appendix, Art. III. Our author himself has quoted from a Latin translation of the last revision, which he says differs only in style, but which in reality differs sufficiently to remove some of the grounds on which he builds, although not to overthrow, his argument.

110 C 10. In which is inserted this prayer] This is true of the present Anglican Ordination Service, in which we have the words now to "be admitted to the Order of Deacons [*or Priests*]", but not of that of Edward VI., in which we find (for Deacons and Priests alike), "That it may please Thee to bless these men, and send Thy grace upon them, that they may duly execute the Office now to be committed unto them, to the edifying of Thy Church, and to Thy honour, praise, and glory."

111, 15. the salvation of mankind] In Mr. Williams's Editions (see the note to p. 110 C—112 A), "the salvacion of mankyndes."

111 B 15. "whether they will be faithful &c.]" This question occurs in the present Anglican Ordinal, but not in that of Edward VI. Compare the note to p. 110 C 10.

112, 13. the Book of the Gospels] This is a mere mistake. Read "the Bible".

i The MS itself, however, has rightly *auc'te*.

113, 6. (compare note *i*). *Accipe &c.*] The words omitted after *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum* are “*quam formam esse dicimus*”, which we say is the form.

CHAPTER VIII.

116 C 3. He returned no other answer] Our author means only that this was the turning point of his defence: for this was by no means his only allegation, see (besides p. 117 C) Strype's Annals, Chap. 34; vol. 1, pp. 377—382, Ed. 3 (1735).

119 B 18. For although he] Feckenham, late Abbot of Westminster, who according to Stapleton had partly from politeness and partly from prudence so addressed Horn.

120 C 4. In 1549] See the note to p. 32 B 4.

120 C 14. almost entire] Our author uses the word *Statute* for any Ordinance of Parliament, though it be not a whole Act. So what he has given here (in his own French) is an abridgment of the Fifth Section only (which is all that concerns the present question) of an Act consisting of six. In the present Edition, however, the Fifth Section is given entire, as being much more satisfactory to the English reader. Mr. Williams had given it with the exception of two short omissions; but as the second of these (like the author's abridgment) altered in some degree the sense of the Act itself, it appeared decidedly best to give the whole.

120 k. This &c.] In the text Courayer had given them in his own language. The words “[See the Editor's notes.]” may be erased. Having been obliged (see the note to 120 C 14) to give this Statute entire in the text, the Editor had thought of only referring to it in the Appendix, but this not having been adhered to, the words in question have become unnecessary.

122, 10. It is as follows:] “*Le voici en François.*” The author had given as before a French abridgment of the first three Sections of the Act, which are all that concern the present question, the remaining twenty-four indeed relating chiefly to the punishment of offenders. In this extract the abridged form has been retained in the present Edition, but given rather more fully, and in the words of the Statute itself.

123 B 5. this new Statute] See the notes to p. 120 C 14 and p. 122 10. Here again the abridgment has been made rather more full, especially in the Fifth Section, in order to give the substance in the words of the Act, which was not entirely the case in Mr. Williams's Editions.

125, 21. “The King's most excellent &c.”] This abridgment is given (for the same reasons as before: see the notes to p. 120 C 14, &c.) in a fuller form than either in the French original or in Mr. Williams's translation.

126, 5. This business, he says, &c.] This passage is printed in the French in italics, and in Mr. Williams's translation with express quotation marks. It is not however a quotation, but only the substance of what Dr. Heylin says.

126 B 5. it was declared] It must be allowed that the Act rather implies than plainly states all this.

127 B 5. and everything therein contained, relating &c.] The words of the Act are “with the Order of Service, &c.” (Sect. II. § 2.) which comes to the same thing.

128, 17. for making Bishops &c.] This Act (1 Ed. 6. c. 2.), scandalous as it

was, did not pretend to do away with Consecration, but only with Election and Confirmation, as is clear from the Act itself. Stat. at Large, vol. 1. p. 623.

131, 15. Which favour was indulged . . .] The omitted words are "unto "them of the Laity".

131 B 8. *Evesges*] Read *Evesques*.

132 h. After "lease." add: See also p. 362.

132, 2. *liera le successour*] In the Edition of 1604 *lyera le successor*. But see also p. 362.

132, 4. *dimissionis,*] The Edition of 1604 omits the comma. But see also p. 362.

132, 5. "B.]" I. e. "Brooke,": see more in the note to p. 362 C 5.

132, 11 with note j. "The Controversy of Ordination &c." by (Thomas) Ward, (London, 1719, posthumous,) was written in answer to Burnet's Work on the subject. Ward was also author of a poem, with notes, intitled "England's "Reformation".

132, 12. It is said &c.] Here Ward evidently translates from Champney's Latin: in the notes to his "England's Reformation", Canto IV, p. 334, he has translated the whole decision in more literal accordance with the French. He professes however to follow Champney, while yet by using the following words he makes Champney's mis-statement even worse than it was of itself:—"He [i. e. "Champney] quotes Brook's Novel Cases, Placito 463. fol. 101. Printed in the "year 1604. By Thomas Wright with Privilege."

133, 26—30. This Work—was not unknown to Champney, for he quotes it] It is from this extract that he has given the Latin passage printed on the preceding page, as appears from the figures he gives in the margin, "placito 463, fol. 101", though he falsely passes it off as Brooke's own Work: "Brokus in Casibus Novellis, placito 463, fol. 101." (*Brooke in his Novel Cases, decision 463, fol. 101.*) adding this note; "Iste liber denuo impressus fuit Londini cum Privilegio anno "1604." (*This book was reprinted at London with Privilege in the year 1604.*) Whence Ward (see above) in the place referred to (see p. 132, 11 with note j, improving the falsehood, quotes as follows: "Of those made in King Edward's "time, Brook, in his Novel Cases, printed cum Privilegio, anno 1604, writes thus: "It is said, &c."

133 m. It was from this very Work, &c.] This appears clearly from his own marginal reference: see the note to p. 133, 26—30.

133, 31. in ascribing to the Judges of Elizabeth's time] Champney's whole passage is as follows: "Judices Regni, sub ipsâmet Elizabethâ Reginâ, Ordinationes Episcoporum factas sub Edvardo adeo in dubium vocarunt, ut eas nullas "fuisse existimasse videantur. Ista enim quidam eorum in libro de Casibus Juris "scribit. Dicitur &c." *The Judges of the Kingdom, under Queen Elizabeth herself, so called in question the Ordinations of the Bishops made under Edward, that they seem to have regarded them as null. For thus does ONE OF THEM write in his Book on Cases of Law: 'It is said &c.' De Vocatione Ministrorum, c. 13, p. 432.*

134, 1. *le Roy*] In this dialect of French *le* often stands for *du* i. e. *de le*.

134, 2 and 3. Read "*Abridgement*" and "*titles: mes icy*".

134 C 5 and 135 4. other beneficed persons] In the Act *Deans* only are mentioned. In the second passage Mr. Williams has translated "Deans".

136 s. et] Read "ac".

136 B 21. And further &c.] This abridgment is given as before (see the notes to p. 120 C 14, &c.) in the words of the Statute itself.

137 B 16. and declares positively] Bramhall seems rather to imply than to declare it positively in the passage referred to.

140 B 7. was never observed with so much exactness] "hath been—done—with as great a care—, or rather more". 8 Eliz. c. 1. § 2. (Stat. at large, p. 816).

CHAPTER IX.

141 B 2. and the Formulary of Ordination] Barlow was on the Commission for reforming the Prayer-book, but it does not appear that he had anything to do with the drawing up of the new Form of Ordination. See more in the note to p. 143 D 10.

142, 4. that Consecration is not necessary, &c.] "In the New Testament, he that is appointed to be a Bishop, or a Priest, needeth no Consecration by the Scripture, for election or appointing thereto is sufficient." Such was Cranmer's opinion. Burnet, *Hist. Ref.* vol. 1. Appendix, p. 228. "The Bp of St. David's saith, That only the appointing." (is sufficient). Such was Barlow's opinion. *Ibid.* p. 230.

142, 5. The thirteenth and fourteenth] Mr. Williams had given the 13th question in full from Burnet, and taken no notice at all of what came from the 14th. In the present Edition Courayer's abridgment has been preserved, but the 13th question added in full at the foot of the page; the 14th (as noted in the same place) is given in full in the text of p. 145.

142, 8. appoint Priests and Bishops] In the 13th question, which is the one that relates to the case of conquest, Bishops are not distinctly mentioned: see note *d*.

142, 10. *Menevensis*, &c.] Part of the 13th question (as may be seen at the foot of the page) was, whether in the case supposed the Prince and temporal men with him, being learned, might "preach and teach the word of God there or no?" The administration of Sacraments, except that of Orders, was not mentioned; so that this additional Erastianism on the part of Barlow and his friends, of allowing the King and his learned men, "the power of administering the Sacraments" generally, was altogether uncalled for.

142, 20. of Sacraments having virtue] The question was: "What is found in Scripture of the matter, nature, effect, and virtue of such as we call the seven Sacraments; so as although the name be not there, yet whether the thing be in Scripture or no, and in what wise spoken of?"

142 B 7. among others] I. e. among other persons. The plural however must not be taken strictly,—as besides "one Talley", who "preached before the Bishop of St. David's [Barlow himself] this doctrine among other things, viz. "That in times past there was none that did preach or declare the word of God truly, nor the truth was never known till now of late'" (*Collier in the place referred to, viz. Eccl. Hist. vol. 2, p. 135, col. 2*), it does not appear that any other was accused together with Barlow of maintaining heresy. The Articles against

Barlow and Talley were exhibited Jan. 11. 1536 (i. e. 1539), their sermons preached Nov. 12 and 19, 1536. Against Barlow's sermon four, against Talley's three items were objected.—See Collier *ubi supra*, and Strype, Ecclesiastical Memorials, vol. 1. p. 287, 8 and Appendix p. 184, 5, Ed. 1721,—both already referred to: see p. 84 B with note *b* as corrected in *these* Notes.

143 D 10. Heylin (Hist. Ref. p. 57, 58) gives a much shorter list, consisting only of the Abp of Canterbury and the last six Bishops, and the six other Divines, and expresses a strong opinion (p. 82, 83) that these same, omitting Day, Bp of Chichester, were the twelve appointed to draw up the new Form of Ordination. But if Burnet is right in saying that Heath, Bp of Worcester, was one of these, and was called before the Council Feb. 8, 1520, and committed to the Fleet Mar. 4 for refusing to sign what the rest had agreed to (vol. 2. p. 143), Heylin must be mistaken in this opinion. And this is the less improbable, because the only reason he assigns is the coincidence of the numbers.

The cause of Heylin's giving a shorter list appears to have been an error in transcribing, viz. that of omitting the Abp of York and the next ten Bps (which might perhaps make an even number of lines) all at once. Collier, to whom also our author refers, repeats Burnet's list with this observation: "The learned Bp Burnet from a manuscript of Dr Stillingfleet gives a different list, on which we ought rather to rely, for Heylin speaks only upon conjecture". Heylin is no doubt wrong, but it does not appear, from his own expressions at least, that he "speaks only upon conjecture"; as he gives his *opinion*, not as to who the Commissioners were, but only as to whether it was these same who revised the Communion Office before the revision of the Church Service generally. Concerning this latter point Burnet makes no doubt: see vol. 2. p. 64.

143 D 11. London] In both Mr. Williams's Editions *Lincoln*.

144, 2. Taylor] In Collier, "Taylor or Tyler".

144, 3—5. and a part—Liturgy] This clause has been corrected according to the additional Errata given at the end of our author's Defence of his present Work, where also he adds "V. p. 255." which (altering the figure) might have made a foot-note, could it have been known then that p. 187 of the present Edition would correspond to p. 255 of the French. See more in the Editor's note to p. 143 D 10.

144 B 11. nor do I find any one scarcely] Barlow, and apparently Barlow only, agreed with Cranmer.

145, 16. *ut prius*] In the answers to the 13th question, where they say of laymen in such a case, "That not only they might, but they ought to teach". Burnet, vol. 1. Records, p. 234.

146 C 3. "In Cranmer's paper",] It has been thought best, to give this passage in full, as Mr. Williams had done, rather than its substance as given by Courayer, who seems to have understood it not altogether correctly.

147, 9. in some writings &c.] The declaration to which Courayer refers is signed by the Lord Cromwell, the two Archbishops, eleven Bishops, and a good many others; but as its date was 1537 or 1538, i. e. two or three years earlier than that of the above answers, it cannot be regarded as of much weight in the present question. Further particulars concerning it will be found in Burnet's Hist. vol. 1. p. 365—367.

151 B 14. In fact, if the invocation &c.] Elsewhere (p. 155 B) he is more cautious, speaking of Baptism and the Eucharist as Sacraments “whose matter and form have been determined by Jesus Christ”, though he thinks it is *perhaps* true that the forms even of these may be altered, and that by particular Churches.

CHAPTER X.

156 B 7. John the Faster] In the French *Jean le Jeûneur*: in both Mr. Williams's Editions *John the younger*!

156 C 5. that though we see] In both Mr. Williams's Editions “it is astonishing to observe”.

160 B 10. she may continue in] In both Mr. Williams's Editions “she *ought* to maintain”. This is not the only instance in which Mr. Williams has made his author speak in a style less accordant with the principles of the Church of Rome than the original warrants. With a similar feeling, no doubt, in his own mind, he has inserted the word *Roman* before *Catholic*, not indeed regularly, for there is nothing of the nature of regularity in his whole translation, but in a good many places. To a member, however, of the Church of Rome, which our author was, *Catholic* and *Roman Catholic* are one and the same thing.

167 C 1. But a still stronger proof—is] This is not quite logical. It should rather have been “But a still more satisfactory answer to the objection is”.

167, l. ult.—168, 2 *Quare—permissam.*] Add, [“Wherefore it seems that we must say altogether that the determination of these things has been left to the decision of the Church.”]

169, 2 and 3. a Latin—a Greek—of which he was a member?] The astonishing Mr. Williams, in both Editions, translates this: “the Latin [Church]—the Greek Church—whereof she is a member;”! The Latin or Greek Church a member of a nation or province!!!

170 B 17. every thing persuades us] In both Mr. Williams's Editions, “we are all persuaded”. In the French, “tout nous persuade”!

170, l. penult. and 171, 1. For as Father Alexander &c.] Father Alexander speaks only of *additions*.

171, 2—5. *Additio—veritas.*] Add, [“The addition of words which corrupt the due sense of the Sacramental form destroys the reality of the Sacrament;... But if an addition of that kind be made, which does not take away the due sense, the reality of the Sacrament is not destroyed.”]

171, 8—14. *Quamvis—Cap. 25.*] Add, [“Although further anything be added contrary to the truth of the faith, yet if it does not affect the form, and does not overflow upon it, or vary its sense, it does not destroy the reality of the Sacrament... But that prayers containing heresy do not render the Sacrament null, when they are adjoined to the Sacramental form, and yet do not affect or corrupt it, St Augustine teaches, Book 6, Concerning Baptism, against the Donatists, Chap. 25.”]

171 B 2. by inattention, or by fraud] An error of Mr. Williams's which has been overlooked:—read, “by inattention or oversight.”

171 B 10. After *sensum* insert, [“the due sense of the Sacramental form”].

171 C 8. “The emendation &c.”] This passage was left in the Latin by Mr. Williams.

172, 25. namely—generally] The present Editor has thought it best to insert these words themselves, rather than a mere mark of omission, as our author has done.

172 h. part 2. *de Ordine*, qu. 4. p. 233] In Mr. Williams's Editions "ubi supra".

173 E 5—7. the possession of &c.] Read, "the possession and practice which the heretical Churches have had of composing—raised against them with regard to the validity" &c.

175 C 8. the great Collection] In both Mr. Williams's Editions "the Greek Collection".

176 E 4. which do not fail to deserve some attention] In both Mr. Williams's Editions "which do not deserve the same attention"!

177, 3. Thy holy Disciples and Apostles] I. e. Thy Apostles to whom the name of Thy Disciples was also in an especial sense given: *τοις ἁγίοις σου ἀποστόλοις καὶ μαθήταις*, in which the single article shews that both terms apply to the same thing.

177, 12. if people have not thought themselves bound] In both Mr. Williams's Editions "if one is not confined", though it is an historical fact that is spoken of.

178, 1. But even though this were not an agreed point] Instead of this Mr. Williams has in his First Edition "But when this does not appear", in his Second "But though this should not appear".

184 B 16. the Sacramental stamp] Called by theologians, the *character*.

CHAPTER XI.

188 B 5. that such is the practice &c.] I. e. that they did but follow the practice &c.

188 C 22. any manner spiritual authority] In the language of this date *any manner* &c. form a kind of adjectives. Compare p. 191 B 17, &c.

191 B 17. all manner her subjects] See the note to p. 191 B 17.

191 B 24. any authority than]. I. e. any other.

191, l. ult. no other foreign Power] The word *foreign* must be understood as explanatory of the word *other*.

192 B 1. For *further* read *farther*.

192 B 5. "I thought good &c.]" The Works of James I were published both in English and Latin. In the Table of Contents of the English Edition the Apology and Premonition are mentioned as follows:

"An Apologie for the Oath of Allegiance, first set out Anonymously, and afterwards published with the Præmonition under His Majesties owne name. P. 247."

"A Præmonition to all Christian Monarches, Free Princes and States, written both in English and Latine by his Majestie. 289."

Of the above passage the present Editor has given His Majesty's own English: our author had given his Latin, which is as follows:

"*Visum itaque e re esse, ut hujus jusjurandi Apologiam ederem, in quâ suscipiebam probandum, nihil in eo contineri, nisi quod ad obedientiam merè civilem ac temporalem spectat, qualis summis Principibus a subditis debetur.*" Jac. I. Opp., p. 289.

The Apology was written originally in English, and afterwards translated into Latin, as we learn from its Royal author in the Præmonition, *Works*, p. 293. That it was first published anonymously (see above) is also stated in the same paper, p. 290. The Præmonition ends on p. 338.

196 C 4, &c. For "the Church of England" read (as elsewhere: see the note to p. 17 B 15, &c.) "the Anglican Church".

197 C 10. That Bishops &c.] The Latin of this passage (see p. 192) is as follows: "Episcopos esse in Ecclesiâ debere, tanquam institutionem Apostolicam, ac ordinationem proinde divinam, semper sensi". *Jacobi I Opera*, p. 304.

198 B 12. that they have so abased &c.] Here might be cited "The Protector's letter to Gardiner concerning the points he was to handle in his sermon" (*Burnet vol. 2, Records Book 1, No. 28*), and "The Commission which the Abp of Canterbury took out for his Archbishopric", in which the King (Edward VI) professes to give him authority to ordain (*Ibid. No. 2*).

(PART OR VOLUME II. OF THE ORIGINAL.)

CHAPTER XII.

201, title of Chap. XII. of Divines, who] Read, "of the Divines who".

201 A, 12—13. Quod—*iteratum*.] Add, ["What is not shewn to have been done, reason does not allow us to regard as repeated."]

201 B, 8—15. *Ordinatio—indubitata*.] Add, ["An Ordination which is only probable, or which is but probably sufficient and valid, constitutes only a probable Bishop, or one who is but probably a Bishop,—is not validly and sufficiently constituted in the Episcopal degree and power,—and has no true Episcopal calling. For the true and valid Episcopal power and calling is not merely probable, but certain and undoubted."]

202 B, 8—10. *Utrum—nescientis*.] Add, ["Whether there be no one at all, who by his testimony can help the ignorance of him who does not know."]

202 B, 12, 13. *Si nulla—vicinos*.] Add, ["If there be no means of information amongst the connections and friends, amongst the Clergy and neighbours."]

203. In the heading, for "proved to be without" read "has no reasonable".

205, 16. justifies it] Read "proves it".

205, 22—25. *Dummodo—characterem*.] Translated on the preceding page.

208. To the first side-title add, "—The Form good." In the last for "frivolous" read "insufficient".

211 C 10. For "parcels" read "partieles".

211 C 11. They had no doubt] I. e. the Anglican Reformers had none.

214 B 11. For "Father Martin" retained in this place through oversight from Mr. Williams's translation, read "Father Martene".

214 B 28. For "was" read "has been", twice.

217 C 7. you other Anglicans] all who have been ordained Priests since the disuse of the Pontifical, by which the first Anglicans were made Priests.

219 B 8. Read "or at least does not then receive both Ordinations at the same time."

223 B 2. *Quid* &c.] The present Editor has corrected the Latin given by

Courayer to that of the Benedictine Edition wherever the latter appeared more correct.

226 p. Reg. Gen. p. 78.] In the English translation by "E. S. [Edward Sheldon^k] Esq.", Paris, 1660,—p. 65, with which however should be compared an explanatory observation, pp. 67—69.

CHAPTER XIII.

237. In the side-titles, for "First" read "Second", and for "Second" "First".

238 B 5. *Qui &c.*] Harding's work was written in English; and as the second reference given by Courayer ("fol. 234") agrees with the English Edition, it seems most probable that his Latin was taken from some preceding writer who had had occasion to cite, and had for that purpose translated the passage. If the English was before our author, why not translate into French rather than Latin? If a Latin translation, how came the passage to occur on the same leaf as in the English?—It should be observed that the first reference ("fol. 231") was given by our author as 129: a manifest error.

240 B 13. After "juridical" add "and solemn".

241 B 17. annulled all that Stephen had done] In the Council of Ravenna, A.D. 904. Stephen VI. and Sergius III. were invaders of the See, detestable characters, and personal enemies of Formosus; their violent and irregular proceedings against whom were legitimately annulled by the Church and the lawfully appointed Pontiffs.

Ibid. who succeeded John] Not immediately. After John IX. were the excellent Benedict IV. A.D. 905, Leo V. 907, the invader Christophorus the same year, and the invader Sergius III, a man of infamous character and the former rival and personal enemy of Formosus, A.D. 908.

242, 7—10. *De Episcopis—Episcopi illi*] These words, which our author had abridged as in p. 273 B, the present Editor has given in full. He has also corrected the whole passage to the text of Muratori in his *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*, with which, excepting the form *placibilis* (see below), the other Editions agree.

The following are the differences found in our author's Edition :

1. *reverterentur*, from Baronius's Annals and the Reg. and Maz. MSS.: in which however (see below) the preceding clause is also in the plural.

2 and 3. *susciperent* and *consecraret*, from Baronius alone.

How little Baronius can be adduced as an authority for the very words, much less forms of words, of Anastasius, will be best shewn by merely transcribing the whole passage as Baronius gives it.

"De Episcopis vero atque presbyteris et diaconibus quos ipse Constantinus consecraverat, ita in eodem Concilio promulgatum est: Ut qui Episcopi ex presbyteris sive diaconibus ab eo ordinati fuerant, in pristinum honoris sui gradum reverterentur. Et si placibile fuisset omni populo civitatis suæ, denuo facto decreto electionis more solito, cum clero et plebe ad Apostolicam venissent Sedem: ab eodem sanctissimo Stephano Papa benedictionis susciperent consecrationem. Presbyteri vero illi et diacones ab eodem Constantino consecrati, simili modo in illum in quo prius existebant habitum reverterentur. Et post-

^k Bodleian Catalogue and MS. addition in Bodleian copy.

“modum si qui eorum placibiles extitissent, antefatus beatissimus Pontifex presbyteros eos aut diacones consecraret [*al. conciliaret*].” An. 769, § v. tom. 9. col. 373 A: Ed. Col. Agr. 1609.

It is clear that Baronius, though for the most part he uses Anastasius's words, has made no point of giving more than his sense: on the contrary he has evidently introduced alterations for the sake of making the sense clearer. (The only difficulty he has left arises from his either having put *cum clero* for *quum cum clero*, or (keeping Anastasius's idiom of *venissent* for *venirent*) omitted the conjunction at the beginning of the following clause, using *ab eodem* for *et ab eodem*.) This idiomatic use, therefore, of the pluperfect for the imperfect should by no means be removed on the supposed authority of Baronius, in opposition to the MSS.

Courayer however in giving this same passage again on p. 273 has further altered *advenissent* into *advenirent*, apparently on conjecture.

4. *placibiles* twice. So in the Moguntine Edition of 1602 (p. 137). In Fabroti's,—Paris, 1649 (p. 95), reprinted with the Byzantine historians Ven. 1729 (p. 51, col. 1),—the *i* is left in the text, but the glossary adopts *placabilis* (the reading of the Reg. Maz. and Thu. MSS), from the various readings at the end. Du Fresne's Glossary gives *placibilis*.

It may be added that the Thu. MS. reads *fuert*: the Reg. and Maz. *ut ipsi illi, si qui presbyteri aut diaconi fuerunt, in pristinos honoris sui gradus revertentur*.

CHAPTER XIV.

245 A 7. For “It is certain” read “It is true”; and to the side-title “Former doubts”, which should begin opposite this line, add “on the general question”.

248 B. The side-note “Peter Lombard.” should be marked as a parenthesis.

248 B 12. *Capuensi*] Otherwise *Capsensi* (see Ed. Paris. and Ed. Col. Agr. 1538, fol. 251 B) or *Carpensi* (see Ed. Col. Agr.) Both *Capse* and *Carpi* are mentioned in Cyprian's Council of Carthage, tom. 2. pp. 118 and 111, Ed. Wirceburgi 1782.

248 B 13. *et reordinationes*] The canon proceeds *vel translationes Episcoporum. Nam Cresconius &c.*; the remainder being occupied with that Bishop's self-translation.

249 D. Morinus goes farther (*plus loin*)] Farther than these principles admit of, or than Divines in general. One should rather have expected *trop loin*, “too far”.

250, 4. *In ritu &c.*] The first section of the ninth Chapter runs as follows:

I. Prima (distinctio) esto: In ritu . . . inepta. Illæ autem tam spectare possunt Ordinantem quam Ordinandum. Ecclesia enim [see p. 257 t] meo iudicio . . . iteranda. . . Hinc sequitur [see p. 257 s], Sacramentorum . . . consecutus.

251, 252. . Add the side-title “No sufficient doubt.”, beginning opposite the last line of p. 251.

253, 4. the crime of reiteration] St. Leo's words *in iterationis crimen venire* (see p. 249) should rather perhaps be rendered “be accused of repetition”.

253 C 17. moment, . . .] the words ‘so long as they are not revoked or abrogated by the Church’ should not have been left out here.

253 D 1. alternative] I. e. proposition containing two alternatives.

254 B 16. all, according to him, &c.] Morinus does not say this, but that some things are in their nature essential, others made so while the Church requires them.

255 B 15. can render &c.] I. e. render the Sacrament null if conferred without them.

258. Add as side-notes, "At all events it does not apply to the case." and "Argument.", beginning opposite lines B 5 and C 1.

262 A 3—5. reordinations—of the Bps ordained since the Reformation] "the Bps ordained" appears to have been written by a slip of the pen for "those ordained by the Bps consecrated".—For "the Reformation" our author had "the revolution", in the same sense.

CHAPTER XV.

263, title] This title has been altered by the author's direction: see the Appendix, p. 366.

Ibid. l. 1. Continuation] "A continuation" D.W. So elsewhere, where the French omits the article.

Ibid. instead of the colon put a full stop.

Ibid. l. 2—4. reflections on—has hitherto] "reflections upon—hitherto has" D.W. See the note to p. 275 u.

264 B 11—13. *ubi—matrem*] The present Editor has given Cyprian's own words: our author had given the sense, not the exact words.

265, 6. the Council of Carthage which he caused &c.] The decision of the Council having been afterwards reversed, it is not reckoned among the regular Councils.

265 B 1. Felix] This is St. Augustine's reading: St. Cyprian has *Primus*. It is possible that *Primus* was first added in St. Cyprian as a note, to distinguish the first mentioned Felix from the rest, and that this note, being taken afterwards for a corrected reading, was substituted for the real name.

265 B 21. not merely by the Africans] I. e. And it was contested not merely by the Africans.

265 C 2. St. Athanasius &c.] These Fathers appear to speak of those heretics only who did not rightly hold the doctrine of the Trinity. See the reasoning of St. Athanasius, in his Third Oration against the Arians, about the danger of nullity in their Baptism, Opp. p. 219 A 4—E 6, Ed. Commelinianæ, A.D. 1601.

As for St. Basil he expressly distinguishes, in the Epistle referred to, between heretics, who denied the faith itself, meaning apparently what related to God Himself; schismatics, who broke away on account of Ecclesiastical questions, i. e., as it would seem, questions relating to His dealings with His Church; and irregular assemblies, separated on private grounds;—and, rejecting the first altogether, leaves the second to the decision of the authorities, and receives the last without hesitation. It must be observed, however, that, although in stating the opinions and practice of others he does not withhold his own ideas, he yet propounds them with evident caution and doubt.—In the words quoted by Courayer he is speaking of the Pepuzeni, whom he accuses of baptizing into the Father, the Son, and Montanus or Priscilla, to which two persons they presumptuously gave the title of

the Paraclete. τίνα οὖν λόγον ἔχει, says he, τὸ τούτων βάπτισμα ἐγκριθῆναι, τῶν βαπτίζοντων εἰς Πατέρα, καὶ Υἱὸν, καὶ Μοντανὸν ἢ Πρίσκιλλαν; (“How then is it reasonable that the Baptism of these should be received, who baptize into the “Father, the Son, and Montanus or Priscilla?”) οὐ γὰρ &c. as in the latter part of Courayer’s quotation.

With respect to St. Cyril see the commentators on that author.

266 B 15. *aufirre*] In Courayer, as in Morinus, *aufert*.

267 B 7. *acceptam denuo benedictionem*] In Courayer *acceptâ denuo benedictione*.

268 B. 6. μεταπαῦτα &c.] Of this passage our author had given only the Latin translation as follows: “*Secundùm hæc, ut egregii Laici, ad eum gradum ordinantur in quâ prius apud suos erant, sive Presbyteri, sive Diaconi, &c.*” The present Editor has given here as elsewhere the original with an English translation.

268 B 8. κ. τ. λ.] εἴτε ὑποδιάκονοι, εἴτε ψαλταναγνώσται. *sive subdiaconi, sive psaltanagnostæ*¹. “or subdeacons, or psaltanagnostos.” Book 4 is the 2d of Synodal Sentences and Pontifical Sanctions, and the above passage is under the head ἀδήλων πατριάρχων 4 (*Of uncertain Patriarchs* 1), which begins on p. 290: compare note *r* as corrected above.

268 B 12. *An Sacerdos &c.*] This question being given obliquely, and its answer not very correctly abridged by our author, it appeared best to leave the Latin as he had given it in the text, and transcribe the Greek question and answer entire in these notes.

Ἐρώτησις λ'. Ἐὰν αἰρετικὸς ἱερεὺς, ἢ διάκονος, ἀξιώθῃ τοῦ θείου καὶ ἁγίου βαπτίσματος, ἢ διὰ τοῦ ἁγίου μύρου ἁγιασθῆ, ἐσεῖται ἱερουργῶν μετὰ τῆς προτέρας χειροτονίας αὐτοῦ, ἢ ἐτέρας ἀξιωθεῖν χειροτονίας, ἐὰν θελήσῃ ἱεουργεῖν;

Ἀπόκρισις. Ὁ τῶν ἁγίων ἀποστόλων π' κανὼν τοὺς ἐξ ἔθνικου βίου προσελθόντας τῇ ὀρθοδόξῳ πίστει καὶ βαπτισθέντας, καὶ ἐπισκοπικοῦ ἀξιώματος καταξιούσθαι διορίζεται. τῆς γοῦν προτέρας ἱερωσύνης μιαιωσύνης νομιζομένης, καὶ ὡς μὴ γινομένης λογιζομένης, ἐὰν μετὰ τῆς κανονικῆς ἀκριβείας ἀνακρινόμενος ὁ οὕτως ὀρθοδοξήσας, καὶ ὧν ποτὲ βέβηλος ἱερεὺς, περὶ τοῦ ὑστέρου αὐτοῦ βίου ἀκατάκριτος ἀναφανείῃ, ἀξιωθεῖν οὐ μόνον ἱερατικοῦ ἀξιώματος, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐπισκοπικοῦ, διὰ τῶν συνήθων πάντως βαθμῶν εἰς τὸ διδρακαλικὸν ὕψος ἀναγόμενος.

“Question 30. If an heretical Priest or Deacon have been honoured with the “divine and holy baptism, or have been sanctified by the holy chrism, shall he “minister in sacred things with his former Ordination, or should he be honoured “with another, if he wish to minister in sacred things?”

“Answer. The 80th Canon of the holy Apostles determines that they who “have come from a heathen life to the Orthodox faith, and have been baptized, “may be honoured with even the Episcopal dignity. His former Priesthood, “therefore, being accounted an abomination, and regarded as having no existence, if, being examined with the canonical accuracy, he who has thus become “orthodox, having formerly been a profane Priest, appear free from censure as to “his subsequent life, he may be honoured not merely with the Sacerdotal, but “also with the Episcopal dignity, being elevated altogether by the accustomed “steps to the Doctorial height [*i. e.* to the Episcopal dignity].”

268 B 14. *possit sacra facere*] In Courayer *possit facere*.

¹ *Qui canunt hymnos et lectores sunt.* “Hymn-singers who are also Readers.”

Book 5 is the 1st of Responses, and the above Answer the 30th of Balsamon's. 268 r. For "p. 290" read "p. 291".

269, 31. For "as an Ordination" read "and an Ordination".

270 B 3. it appears to me &c.] The expression is *χειροθετουμένων*, which Joseph of Egypt (whose Arabic exposition of the Four first General Councils is given at the end of Beverege's Synodicon) interprets similarly of re-ordination. Neither Balsamon nor Zonaras, however, mention any such thing; and Aristenus, whose shorter Scholia follow theirs in the above Collection, distinctly explains it of Confirmation; which is the more probable, because in speaking of Ordination farther on in the same Canon (which relates to the Cathari or Novatians) the verb *χειροτονεῖν* is employed.

270 B 16. the words of the Canon] The Canon itself is as follows:

δ. Περὶ Μαξίμου τοῦ Κυνικοῦ, καὶ τῆς κατ' αὐτὸν ἀταξίας τῆς ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει γενομένης. ὥστε μήτε τὸν Μάξιμον ἐπίσκοπον ἢ γενέσθαι ἢ εἶναι, μήτε τοὺς παρ' αὐτοῦ χειροτονηθέντας ἐν οἴῳ δήποτε βαθμῶ κλήρου πάντων καὶ τῶν περὶ αὐτὸν καὶ τῶν παρ' αὐτοῦ γενομένων ἀκυρωθέντων. Conc. tom. 2. col. 947 C, D.

"4. Concerning Maximus the Cynic, and the disorder which took place in Constantinople in his case, (they determined) that neither Maximus either had been or was a Bishop, nor those ordained by him in whatever rank of the Clergy (were such); all things which had been done either with respect to him or by him having been declared null."

271, 2. *Quia Photius Maximo* &c. In the Greek-Latin Edition of the Council, which is considerably shorter than that of Anastasius, this passage does not occur. See Conc. tom. 8. columns 1296 and 1295, E.

271, 24. Ignatius] The Patriarch whose rival Photius was.

271, 27. which proves] I. e. (apparently) because Photius would not be likely to re-ordain first. The clause however appears of no great use.

271, 29. in his letter to the Emperor Michael] Rather, in one of his letters to the Emperor Michael.

272, 2. *nihil habuit, nihil dedit, &c.*] So Morinus also (part 3. exerc. 5. cap. 4, § 4) gives the passage. In the Anastasian Edition of the Eighth Council (tom. 8. col. 1012 D. Ed. Paris. 1671) we find only *nihil habuit, se sequentibus propinaverit*; (which, if the reading be right, must mean, "had nothing, communicated to his followers nothing but himself":)—in the Greek-Latin (Ibid. coll. 1296, 5, E) merely *οὐδὲν ἔσχε, οὐδὲν ἔδωκεν*: *nihil habuit, nihil dedit*: "had nothing, gave nothing." With Morinus's reading compare the expression of Innocent I: *Damnationem utique, quam habuit, per pravam manus impositionem dedit*. "Damnation indeed, which he had, by the wicked imposition of his hand he gave." Ep. 22. § 3 (Conc. tom. 2. col. 1274 A, B.) Also that of Formosus: *οὐδὲν ἠδυνήθη δοῦναι Φώτιος ἐκτὸς κατακρίσεως, ἧς ἔσχε διὰ τῆς ἐπιθέσεως τῆς σκολιᾶς χειρὸς, καὶ ἐγκατάκρισιν δέδωκε, Photius nihil dare potuit præter damnationem, quam per impiæ manus impositionem habuit, damnationemque dedit*. "Photius could give nothing except damnation, which he had by the imposition of the perverse hand, and damnation he gave." (Ibid. coll. 1412, 11, C.)

272, 6. and that it is for this reason] To make sense of the whole passage we must understand this to mean 'who says also that it is for this reason'.

272, 8. *Quos idem* &c. In the Greek-Latin Edition, *οὓς αὐτὸς ἐν οἴφδηποτε*

βαθμῆ προεβάλετο, ἀφορίζομεν ἐπαξίως. *quoscumque ille in quocumque Clericorum gradu collocavit, merito exortes communionis facimus.* "Those whom he ordained to "whatever degree, we deservedly excommunicate." (Ibid. coll. 1296, 5; D, E.)

273, 4. *Eos . . . in (Eos generaliter in) &c.]* In the shorter Greek-Latin Edition we have only, *χρῆναι δεχθῆναι λέγομεν, recipiendos dicimus,* "we say should "be received". (Ibid. coll. 1297, 8, A.)

273 B 23. *isdem]* So the Editions and Maz.

273 B 24. *iterata fuissent]* So in Muratori's text, to which the present Editor has corrected the whole passage. The Reg. and Thu. Maz. read *iteranda essent*, which our author adopted. Baronius has *iterari debuissent*. *Iterata fuissent* is probably to be construed as *iterarentur*: *iterari debuissent* (if meant as Anastasius's words) as *iterari deberent*. The pluperfect however in the sense of *should have been* is not inadmissible in this author's Latin. (See more in the note to p. 242, 7—10.)

275 u] This note of Mr. Williams's was wrongly attached in his own Editions to the beginning of the last paragraph of p. 276. The correction of his translation of the remainder of this Chapter has been, of course, a delicate business, and one requiring very particular care, Mr. Williams alone having been in possession of the corrected French. His usual blunders, however,—going even to the destruction of the argument,—made it absolutely necessary; and as most of the original matter remained, (the greater part of the alterations being merely transposition and abridgment,) the necessary corrections, after a little search, were sufficiently certain. In order however to satisfy every reader, in the following notes are given all the differences between Mr. Williams's and the present Edition, not excepting even mere corrections of style. The French as originally published by Courayer, is added by Mr. Williams at the end of his Editions, and continued (as all his other matter is) in this also. It is only to be regretted he did not give rather, or also, the French as corrected by the author, instead of confining us to his own wretched version of it.

275 C 3. After *Ecclesie* insert "[On the method and right of finishing the "controversies of the Church]".

Ibid. has proposed] Quære, "proposed"? (See the note to p. 275 u.)

275 C 5. Though somewhat] Though it be somewhat D.W. (Daniel Williams.)

275 C 7. and well deserves] and that it very well deserves, D.W. et il mérite bien (and it well deserves) P.F. (Printed French.)

276 a. This note is omitted by D.W.

276 B 2. the validity of Ordination] a valid Ordination D.W. la validité de l'Ordination P.F.

276 B 3. either by our Saviour, or in default] by Christ or for want D.W. soit par J. C., soit a son défaut P.F.

277, 1. point] article D.W. article P.F.

277, 2. in fact] in effect D.W. en effet P.F.

Ibid. it is not thought] it cannot be imagined D.W. on ne croit P.F.

for any other reason than because] but for this reason that D.W.

277, 4. a consequence] in consequence D.W. une suite P.F.

277; 5, 6. error cannot—error] an error does not—an error D.W. l'erreur ne sauroit—l'erreur P.F.

277, 7. cannot the Church herself arrest her own power] the Church herself cannot put a stop to her proper power D.W. *a rendering so absurd as to destroy his author's whole argument.*

277, 8. as her work what has been performed] for her own work (*in Ed. 1 operation*) what was performed D.W. pour son ouvrage ce qui se seroit fait P.F.

277, 9. maintains it] asserts it D.W. le soutient P.F.

277, 10. at what point it could be disputed] how it can be disputed with him D.W. par où on pourroit le contester P.F.

277 B 3. want] defect D.W. défaut P.F.

277 B 5. by comparing the case of Marriage, in which the matter and form are in vain made use of] by a comparison of it with Marriage, where the matter and form would be in vain made use of D.W. par le comparaison du Mariage, où en vain employe-t-on la matière et la forme P.F.

277 B 8. in default of authority] by a defect of authority D.W. par le défaut d'autorité P.F.

277 C 1. He says that it is [thus] &c.] Ou conçoit ainsi aisément P.F.

277 C 2. that was invalid] More exactly, perhaps, as in the P.F. "from "invalid, which it was, (d'invalide, qu' elle étoit)."

277 C 3. without any thing new intervening [therein.] More probably, as in the P.F. "without anything visible intervening anew therein (sans que rien de "sensible y intervienne de nouveau)". The word *therein* ought clearly to be added as in the P.F., being necessary to the sense, and Mr. Williams's omission or insertion of such words being, as may be seen through his whole version, and not least in these altered pages themselves, a mere matter of chance.

277 C 4. the Church, &c.] "the Church, which at first in refusing her "consent hinders this Sacrament from having its effect, but afterwards, taking "away this incapacity, by her consent, she reintegrates what at first was done; "and that nothing more is wanting &c." D.W.

Such is the "translation" (!) which Mr. Williams *continues unchanged in his second "corrected" (!) Edition*, and which he has the assurance to tell us "is "sufficient for the English reader"! (See his Preface p. 10.) To the present Editor it appears better calculated for *puzzling a Sphinx*. He has therefore translated according to the Printed French, the whole difference between which and the above unmeaning jargon,—if one may judge from past experience of Mr. W.'s random blundering—is most probably all his own.

278, 3. as a principle] for a principle D.W.

278, 4. of the Sacrament] of a Sacrament D.W. du Sacrement P.F.

278, 6. and that others (*or*, the rest) have been received;] and that the Church has received others: D.W. et que on ait reçu les autres; P.F.

278, 8. as a matter of condescension, &c.] So the P.F. to condescend to recognise these, and not to admit the rest, either upon the account of severity or prudence D.W.

278; 11, 12. For *auctoritate Ecclesiæ* read *Ecclesiæ auctoritate*.

278, 15. the reconciling of] the reconciling D.W.

278, B 1. that in the case &c.] So the P.F. Mr. Williams, *most ridi-*

subously, "that the heretics reasoned upon this principle in the business of

B: Baptism;" !!!

at 278 B 3. as has been shewn before] as it is shewn before D.W.

o. *Ibid.* did not always argue in the same way] have not always argued the same

of y D.W.

Cou279 B 2. maintains] pretends D.W. There can be no doubt that the French

2s *pretend*, i. e. maintains.

of th79 B 5. in yielding themselves] in abandoning themselves D.W. en s'en rap-

portant P.F.

279 C 3. and if it has] and that if it has D.W. in his First Edition.

279 C 5. by fact and by the practice] So in Mr. Williams's Second Edition.

In the First, by the facts and the practice.

279 C 6. and has never been made use of to explain the difficulty in question.]

and which can never serve to explain the difficulty in debate. D.W. This clause,

making neither grammar as connected with what goes before, nor good sense as

applied to the subject, is no doubt one of Mr. Williams's usual random renderings.

The P.F. has the following: "en voyant qu' on ne s'en est jamais servi dans

"l'Eglise, pour expliquer la difficulté dont il est question"; from which, and the

following sentence it appears most probable that the corrected French was, *et qu'*

on ne s'en est &c.

279 C 11. of the whole] of this affair D.W. de tout ceci P.F.

279 C 13. now received (received at this time D.W.)] jusq' ici (up to this time)

P.F.: compare however the title of Chap. 14.

279 C 14. is adopted] Read "holds good". Mr. Williams has "takes

"place": the P.F. "a lieu".

CHAPTER XVI.

281 B 8. the validity of the Ordinations of these Bishops was contested only

on the opinion, now abandoned, &c.] This is decidedly incorrect. Sanders says

distinctly (book 3, p. 348, 349.), that whereas their own laws required that the

Ordinations should be performed by three Bishops with the consent of the Metro-

politan, and that none otherwise ordained should be recognized as a Bishop,

"they had neither three (or even two) Bishops among them, nor any Metropolitan

"at all of their perfidy who had been ordained before by other Bishops"; "and

"so, being commonly said to be destitute of any legitimate Ordination, and by the

"English laws themselves truly proved not to be Bishops^m, they were forced to

"invoke the secular arm" to pardon any irregularity or deficiency, and confirm

them in their Office after they had held it for some years "without any Episcopal

"Consecration". It is the more remarkable that our author should have made this

mistake, because he has quoted from p. 348 on each of the next two pages.

281 C 2. For "English" read "Anglican": compare the note to p. 17 B 15, &c.

282, 18. "all such, &c.]" Courayer had given this quotation in Latin: "*illam*

demum Divina Officia et Sacramenta celebrandi formulam, quæ ultimo Henrici

VIII anno, vulgari in usu fuit."

^m So in the Edition of 1610, of which

Courayer himself makes use: in the Edition

of 1585 the expression is still stronger, viz.

"being therefore destitute of any legitimate

"Ordination, when they were commonly

"said, and by the English laws themselves

"were truly proved, not to be Bishops, &c."

(fol. 166).

- 282, 27. For "has preserved several for us" read "has preserved us many".
- 284, 285. In the headings, instead of "The new Form &c." read "Admission
" in favour of the new Form." f
- 284, 3. For "these" read "those". is
- 284, 4. did not last] I. e. was not actually used: it was in legal force long
- 284 B. The second side-title should be "Admission of Cardinal Pole." 1
- 290 C 2—4. Cromwell—ureter. (Cromwel—uretère).] In this awkward
has our author abridged what Pascal had written as follows: "Cromwel a'
" ravager toute la Chrétienté: la famille Royale étoit perdue, et la sienne à jamais
" puissante; sans un petit grain de sable qui se mit dans son uretaire. Rome même
" alloit trembler sous lui." *Cromwell was about to lay waste all Christendom: the
Royal family was destroyed, and his own powerful for ever; without a little grain
of sand, which fixed itself in his ureter. Rome herself was about to tremble under
him.* § 14. pp. 159, 160. Ed. Paris. 1725.

291 1. that is to say, &c.] "And here it may not be improper to observe,
" that nine of the Bishops surviv'd the Rebellion, and recover'd their Sees at the
" Restoration, viz., William Juxton Bp of London, translated this year to Canter-
" bury, William Pierce Bp of Bath and Wells, Robert Skinner Bp of Oxford, trans-
" lated afterwards to Worcester, John Warner Bp of Rochester, William Roberts
" Bp of Bangor, Matthew Wren Bp of Ely, Bryan Duppa Bp of Salisbury, from
" whence after the Restoration he was remov'd to Winchester, Henry King Bp
" of Chichester, Accepted Frewen Bp of Coventry and Litchfield, and this year
" promoted to the Archbishopric of York." Collier in the place referred to.

291 s. Collier's words, continuing from those just quoted, are: "Besides
" these, there were six Bishops consecrated on the first Sunday in Advent, viz., John
" (Cosens) Lord Bp of Durham, William Lord Bp of St. David's, Benjamin Lord
" Bishop of Peterborough, Hugh (Laney) Lord Bp of Landaff, Richard (Stern)
" Lord Bp of Carlisle, Bryan (Walton) Lord Bp of Chester, and John (Gauden)
" Lord Bp of Exeter. When Juxton was translated to Canterbury, Gilbert
" Sheldon was made Bp of London. (See Abp Sancroft's Life and Sermons.)
" The other Bishopricks were quickly fill'd with well qualify'd persons."

CHAPTER XVII.

- 293 D 3. there is no dispute] I. e. none with any show of reason.
294. In the first side-title, for "his" read "Parker's".
- 296, 3. 'there is no controversy &c.] Bramhall's words (p. 338) are: Con-
" cerning the two former, I know no controversy between the Church of Rome
" and us but one, Whether the Bishop of Rome alone do derive his jurisdiction
" immediately from Christ, and all other Bishops do derive theirs mediately by
" him? Yet I confess this controversy is but with a part of the Church of Rome:
" For many of them are of our mind, that all Bishops hold their jurisdiction
" immediately from Christ, as well as the Pope. &c." "The third power of
" Bishops," he defines (p. 339) as "the power of exterior jurisdiction in the Court
" of the Church, whereby men are compelled against their wills by exterior
" means. This," continues he, "the Apostles had not from Christ, nor their Suc-
" cessors from them, neither did Christ ever assume any such power to Himself in
" the world."

The present Editor has distinguished (as in other places) the direct words of Bramhall from what is but Courayer's statement of his meaning. Mr. Williams attempted to give the whole in Bramhall's words, as follows: "Concerning—but one, &c. But we have a controversy with some others &c. The third power of Bishops, . . . This—world." These words, it is plain, do not contain all Courayer intended to adduce.

296 C, 5—8. in the ancient Church, who did not regard as null &c.] Instead of this erroneous version, retained by oversight from Mr. Williams's translation, read, "in the ancient Church; that neither the Ordinations, nor the Sacrifice, nor the other Sacraments administered by the Nestorians, the Eutyechians, and the other heretics have been regarded as null;".

297, 2. Instead of Mr. Williams's rendering "there was no mention made", read "nothing has been said to them".—In line 5, for "was" read "has been".

297 B 21. For "it has been" read "one has".

(AUTHOR'S APPENDIX :—PROOFS.)

301, Art. I, title. For "[Translation" read "[† Translation".

301, 3. in all the senses] In Italian, not *virtue* only, but also *a taste for the fine arts and for curiosities*, is expressed by the word *virtù*, in which Italian form the word is adopted by ourselves in the same peculiar sense. See Dr. Johnson's Dictionary.

302, 9. heresy.] Read "the heresy."

302, Art. II, title.) in this Work] The original adds "avec la version Française à la côté (with the French rendering at the side)", which words together with the rendering itself are of course omitted in the English Editions.

In these Statutes have been retained the more remarkable of the old spellings, or rather old *forms* of words, which appear in Keble's Edition; but as the spelling of that Edition is clearly not that of the original Statutes themselves, but (generally at least) that of Charles II, it has not been thought necessary to make any point of doing so. It may however be added here, that *only* is spelt *onely*; *Majesty's*, *Majesties*; *supreme* generally *supream*; and that *virtue* in p. 302, § 1 (not in § 2), also in p. 309, § IV, is spelt *vertue*; *privileges*, p. 302, with a *d*; *tranquillity*, p. 303, § 1, with but one *l*; *Highness* in the middle, and *do* at the end, of p. 305, § VI, with a final *e*; *pains*, p. 306 A (not p. 307), and *joined*, p. 307, with the diphthongs *ei* and *oy*; and *merely*, p. 311 A, with *ee* (*meerly*).

303, 10. *Rep.* 1 & 2 P. & M. 8. St. 8. *El.* 1.] This memorandum of the Editor of the Statutes at Large, which our author has in this single instance retained, is intended to advertise the reader that this Act was repealed by 1 & 2 Philip and Mary, c. 8; and to refer him also to a Statute of the 8th of Eliz., c. 1, in which also it is mentioned.

§ II, title, l. 1. "Statute concerning the necessity &c."] Rather "Statute shewing the necessity &c." The reader must remember the object for which this Act is adduced, viz. to shew that though the Government of Henry VIII assumed to itself the right of ordering, and if possible compelling, the Primate to grant such dispensations as they thought reasonable, they nevertheless did not attempt to grant them with their own hands, but only by menacing him, and

in case of his continued refusal, finding other Bishops who were willing to give them.

Ibid. l. 2. or to some Bishop] This is not very accurately expressed. By Sect. XV the rights of the Abp of York and the other Bps to grant such dispensations as they could lawfully grant before this Act, were preserved, but the Papal dispensations were to be granted,—regularly indeed by the Primate himself, or, in case of the vacancy of the See, the Guardian of the Spiritualities (see Sect. XVI),—but in case the Primate (or Guardian) refused, and the Chancellor (or Keeper of the Great Seal) thought such refusal contemptuous, then by any such two “spiritual Prelates or persons” willing to comply as should be appointed by the King for the purpose.

Ibid. § 1, l. 6 enormities] I. e. irregularities, from *e* out of, and *norma* rule.

304 B 7. [and owing to contempt of the Act,] It is remarkable that our author should have overlooked the words “of wilfulness in contemning the due execution of this Act” (Sect. XVII, § 3), and “in contempt of this Act” (§ 5), which are really very much to his purpose, as they shew that in this instance at least the object was less the bringing the Church under the power of the State than the forcing the English Clergy themselves by the secular arm, to resist the See of Rome. So long, therefore, as the Ecclesiastical authorities themselves were willing to do this of themselves, the Government was satisfied; but as the contrary might happen, and the Primate refuse to grant Papal dispensations, it became necessary for the carrying out of their plans, to appoint some Court by which, in case of the Primate’s refusal, it might be ascertained whether such refusal sprang in reality from his regarding the dispensation itself as improper, or merely from an unwillingness to use a power which before had been peculiar to the Pope. It would seem, therefore, that the business of the Chancellor (or Keeper of the Great Seal) was not so much to examine into the nature of the dispensation for its own sake as with a view to determine the character of the Primate’s refusal; and that the lay authority was under no necessity, to say the least, or rather had no right by the terms of the Act, to sift the details of theological questions, but merely to examine sufficiently to enable it to determine whether the Primate was acting in contempt, or not.

Of course it is obvious that in practice such a power would easily be made absolute, and besides being an important engine towards the extensive changes so shortly to follow, would tend in a very important degree, even if ever so moderately used, to elevate the Civil and depress the Ecclesiastical authority.

305, l. nominate] I. e. *nominatus*, nominated. The more usual way is to turn the Latin participles, *nominate*, *corrupt*, &c. into new verbs, signifying *to make nominate*, *to make corrupt*, &c.

305 B 7. a corporal oath] I. e. an oath taken by one’s self, *tactis corporaliter sanctis evangeliis*, touching the holy gospels with one’s own body, and not by proxy.

305 C 2. Chapter] In the next page the word is spelt without the *i*, as we may suppose it was pronounced in later times: we find at all events in Whit-churche’s spelling *chapter* for what in Grafton’s (which is generally of an older fashion: see the second paragraph of the second note to p. 312, latter part) is *chapiter* or *chapitre*, which could not have been if the *i* had been commonly pronounced,—

the custom being, *not* to drop letters in writing *before* they are dropped in reading, but on the contrary to retain them long after.—It would seem therefore that the retention of the form *chapter* as an Architectural term in the modern English Bibles is an inconsistency on the part of those who have had the management of the privileged presses; it being a mere question of spelling, which (right or wrong) it has been their principle to modernize. At least they should prove that as an Architectural term, in which sense alone they retain the *i*, the word made three syllables at the date of the last revision; though at the same time it cannot be doubted that in very many other instances the alterations they have made are alterations, in reality, not merely of the spelling, but of the forms of the words themselves. See more in the second note to p. 312, latter part.

306, 15. Præmunire] In Keble *Premunire*. The reader must understand that in those times, both in Latin and in English, the diphthongs *æ* and *æ* were written as well as pronounced as the single vowel *e*.

306, § IV. Such Form &c.] This, as the reader may see, is but an abstract or extract of an Act of Parliament.

306 § V. then] In the older language *then* is used for both *then* and *than*, “this is better than that” being in reality “this is better, then that”. In the Anglo-Saxon both particles took *a* as their vowel.

308 i.] This mistake must have been corrected in part at least of the Edition, as in the copy before the present Editor, which is that of Worcester College Library, “Edward” is printed very plainly.

310, 1. Consecrate] I. e. *Consecrati*, Consecrated. See the note to p. 305, 1.

312 B. It has been thought better here, as in the text, to give the English reader,—not a mere Latin translation, which, however “authorized in the Realm”, we cannot suppose was ever really used in ordaining,—but the actual English Service by which the Ordinations have been performed. The prose has been given as before from Dr. Cardwell’s Editions (concerning which, however, see the following notes), except in one instance, in which his reading was both worse in itself, and found in but one, the right reading existing in the other five, of the Bodleian copies: see the note to p. 317, 9. Concerning the verses see the following notes.—The Epistles and Gospels it has not been thought necessary by the present Editor, any more than it was by the author, to print in full.

312, latter part. THE FORM &c.—retained.] This portion of the Office is thus not altogether correctly abridged in the Latin given by our author:

“FORMA SIVE RITUS ORDINANDI PRESBYTEROS. *Post Exhortationem, qualis describitur in Ordinatione Diaconorum, sequatur statim S. Cœnæ administratio. Epistola verò prælegatur ex Act. cap. 20. à versu 17. ad 36. vel si fortè contingat eodem die et Diaconos et Presbyteros ordinari, totum cap. 3. 1. ad Timoth. Postea legatur etiam pars Evangelii extrema secundum Matth. à versu 18. ad finem; vel illud Joan. 10. à versu 1. ad 17. vel Joan. 20. à versu 19. ad 24.*”

In which it is clear that the insertion of the words *si fortè contingat eodem die et Diaconos et Presbyteros ordinari*,—besides being out of place here, this case being correctly provided for (both in the Latin and in the English) in the concluding Rubric of the Ordering of Priests (p. 317, end),—limits wrongly the reading of 1 Tim. iii to this particular case.

Ibid. THE FORM &c.] The reader must understand that the difference in

what is carelessly called *spelling* is so great between the Service as really published in 1552 and the reprint which Dr. Cardwell professes to give of it, that the latter is in reality better entitled to be called a translation than a reprint. As however what is here given is but an extract, and the difference, though in reality far more than one of mere spelling, does not in the slightest degree affect the theological purpose for which the extract itself was reprinted by our author, and especially as he was satisfied with a mere Latin translation, it appeared needless, for this Appendix, to undergo the labour of re-writing the whole. At the same time it cannot but be much regretted that the learned Editor in question should not have given the public his two books of King Edward in the same old language in which they were originally published, and not treated as mere matters of spelling such differences as *emonges* and *amongst*, *vouchsaufe* and *vouchsafe*, &c. &c. In his own Editions indeed he has allowed the printer so far to modernize the "spelling" as in one instance (p. 313, 30) to destroy altogether the metre, by substituting *unto the world's end* for *unto [untó] the WORLDES end*, as it was printed in the old Editions.

The spelling of Grafton's impressions, it may be observed, is on the whole more antiquated than that of Whitchurche's, and retains in it some letters which it appears from Whitchurche had ceased to be actually pronounced, as the *i* in *chapter* (see the note to p. 305 C 2), and the *c* in *appoinct*. So too, *elles* (in some impressions) for *els* (*else*), and *awne* for *own*. This last indeed may have been more than a mere difference of spelling, as *vouchedsaufe* for *vouchsafed* clearly is. Of the same nature are *thende*, *thothe*, *tharchbishop*, which however are not used regularly nor in all his impressions. *John* is spelt by him *Jhon*; *Timothy*, *Timothe* by both. On the other hand Whitchurche retains *to geve*, &c., which in Grafton's impressions are *to give* or *gyve*, &c. Grafton has also in some instances (perhaps by mistake) *ministrie*, which in Whitchurche's, and elsewhere in his own impressions, is *ministerie* (*ye*, or *y*). The spelling *indevor*, which occurs once at least in two of Grafton's impressions, seems to shew that the word was pronounced then as now.

312, 313. As in the case of the hymn *Veni Creator*,—all the innumerable beautiful and devotional effusions which the old English Breviaries contained, and of which (including the *Officium Parvum* of Our Blessed Lady), in the Ordinary Prayer Services alone, *sixteen* were said *daily*, the only one which the Compilers of the Anglican Prayer-book thought fit, within the whole range both of Ordinary and of Occasional Offices, to retain,—the Latin is the original, the present Editor has given the reader the opportunity of comparing the translation with its beautiful source: which before the Reformation was said in the Pentecostal Service (as the Tierce hymn on Whit Sunday, Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday), and in the Preparation for the Mass.

Instead of *Paraclītus* and *Paraclītus*, our author had incorrectly *Paracletus*; instead of *spiritalis*, *spiritualis*.—For *perpeti* is read otherwise *perpetim*. At the end of the hymn, "Amen.", forgotten in our author's Edition, should be added within brackets.

In *Paraclītus*, derived from the Greek Παράκλητος, first the *ē* became *ī* by *iota-cism* (a particular case of a general principle which, though hitherto unnoticed by grammarians, has had the most extensive and important influence on the develop-

ment and progress of language, but of which this is not the place to speak more particularly), and secondly, in order that the retention of the Greek might not be inconsistent with the rules of the Latin accent, the *i* was shortened where possible into *ĭ*; where the metre forbade this, the place of the accent was changed.—Of the same iotacism other instances are *acidia* (or *accidia*), for ἀκηδία, sloth,—*eleison* for ἐλέησον, have mercy,—first *e-le-ī-son*, then shortening the *i* and uniting it in a diphthong with the preceding *ē*, *e-lei-son*; which when most convenient was joined by apocope or crasis to the preceding *Kyrie* (Lord) or *Christe* (Christ), so as to make the whole *Ky-rī' ē-lei-son* or *Ky-rī-ē-lei-son*, *Christ' ē-lei-son* or *Chris-tē-lei-son*; as we gather not merely from the frequent ancient spelling *Kyrieleyson* (or *Kyri el.*) and *Christeleyson*, but also from the musical notation in ancient books, and especially the actual division of the syllables in the Salisbury Gradual.—It may be added that the frequency of the *iotacism* in pronunciation (without altering the writing) gave at length an additional sound to the vowel *e*, whence not merely the modern Latin *Letania* and (thence derived) the old English *Letany* for *Litania* and *Litany*, but also in the English of the present day it has become the law of the language to iotacise the *e* as a matter of course when long or closing an unaccented syllable.

In the English, the present Editor has marked the divisions of the double verses; which, together with a few accents, added to point out some of the differences in this respect between ancient and modern pronunciation, and the differences of the “spelling” so far as they appear to affect the metre, will, it is hoped, considerably assist the reader. Of the same nature is the addition of the diæresis in *dissensiōn*. The syncopation in *enmy*, is on the direct authority of the particular copy from which Dr. Cardwell reprinted in opposition to the metre *enemy*, (“I. 2. 6. Med.” of the Bodleian Library, one of Whitechurche’s,) which in this respect is more accurate than the rest, reading *enmie*. *Heavenly* is to be counted as a dissyllable, i. e. (as we should now write it) *heav’nly*; in which kind of words, as the insertion of the *e* adds nothing to the sound, but only marks that the *n* (*l* or *r*) is viewed as forming with the preceding consonant a distinct syllable, so its withdrawal takes nothing away, but merely shews that what might otherwise be regarded as two syllables is then to be considered as but one.

So in *devil* and *evil*, the insertion, which one sometimes hears, of an actual *i*, is highly incorrect; and though the few who insert it, do so no doubt from pure mistake, they certainly run no small risk of being accused of one of those affectations of precision which overshoot themselves into egregious mistakes, the pronunciation in question being contrary in fact not merely to general custom,

Quem penes est arbitrium et jus et norma loquendi (Hor. De Arte Po. v. 72),

but also still more to etymology, there being nothing in the derivation of either word to require a real *i*, the former having *o* in the Greek and *u* in the Saxon (*diouful*), and in the German both words having only a mute *e*,—the forms in that sister language being *Teufel* (pronounce nearly *Toiftl*) and *Uebel*,—pronounce nearly *Eebl*; or, to be quite exact, *ābl* with the Freuch *u*; but the German *ue* or *ü* (French *u*) becomes *ee* in English in the regular course of etymology; just as the Greek *υ* (*y*) has now become a mere *i* (*y-grec*, i. e. Greek *y* or *i*) as well in the rest of Europe as in modern Greece itself. *Devil* was formerly *diuel*, so that it may possibly be only to some strange transposition that our present irregular spelling

is owing. *Evil* is in the Saxon *yfel*, so that even if the present spelling does in this case represent the real pronunciation of any intermediate age, still as custom has now restored the older way of pronouncing, if it were correct in any case to have a pronunciation of one's own, it is doubly incorrect to resist at once the received pronunciation and the etymology.

The word *devil* it will be observed occurs in these verses, and that probably as a monosyllable, which way of scanning we commonly express (see above) by writing *dev'l*. It is possible, however, that a spare syllable (especially so short a syllable) might not be objected to at the division of the verses; although, it must be observed, we do not find it elsewhere in these verses, either at the division or at the end.

Spirit is everywhere except in the fifth verse from the end, a monosyllable, *Spir't*, or rather perhaps *Sp'rit* (i. e. *Spreet*): compare the French *Esprit* and our *spright*.

313, 6. *spir'tuall*. Or *sp'rituall*. See the preceding paragraph.

313, 22. *Christen* is so written in the original Editions themselves, and as this agrees *better* with the metre, the original form has in this instance been retained: see above.

313, 30. *Worldes end*] In Dr. Cardwell's (as also in Keeling's) Edition this was mutilated into *world's end*, to the utter destruction of the metre. The apostrophe is never used in the original Editions, *es* being always written in full, whether so pronounced or not. If therefore persons choose to introduce the modern "spelling", which may well be protested against,—at least wherever it is not sufficiently ascertained that the difference *is* one of *spelling* only,—they should at least spare those passages in which the modernizing of the "spelling" is the destruction of the metre.

313 B 5. *Diaconatus*] Add, [*With questioning and answering as in the Order of the Deaconship*].

317, 9. *thy benefits*] In both Dr. Cardwell's Editions "*the benefits*", which is a mere misprint in the copy he selected to print from (see the note to p. 312, 313), the other five of the six copies in the Bodleianⁿ, all reading (what the sense evidently requires) *thy*. So too the Edition of 1549, of the existence of which and of its important differences from that of 1552 Dr. C. appears to have been equally unaware.

318, 6. "1 Tim. iii" is wanting in Whitchurche's Editions, from one of which Dr. Cardwell copied, but is supplied in those of Grafton. So too for "John xxi" in the Editions of Whitchurche we have "John iiiii", but in those of Grafton rightly "Jhon xxi".

318, 15. *touching the knowledge*] So Whitchurche. Grafton has *knowlegging*: the present Form *acknowledgment*.

318, 27. *forth*] in the old Editions *furth*.

321, Art. IV, l. 2. *the ceremony begins with the reading of the Epistle and Gospel*] To see the incorrectness of this statement, the reader has only to turn back to p. 312.

ⁿ Dr. C. says there are four, but there are really six, copies there, viz. four (two Whitchurche and two Grafton) in the

General, and two (both Grafton) in the Douce, Collections.

Ibid. l. 10. which are different &c.] Neither is this altogether correct. In the old service a choice of three, in the new a choice of two, Gospels is allowed; the second Gospel being the same in both.

323, Art. V, title of the Bull PP.] I.e. *Papa*; an abbreviation taken from the MSS.

324, 37. arbitrio tuo] So the present Editor has corrected what in Courayer is *arbitrio suo*.

325, 35. seu honorum] The *seu* seems too much.

325, 43. ecclesiæ] In Courayer *ecclesia*.

326, 2. quæ in] In Courayer *in quæ in*.

327; 3, 4. eorum] Read *earum*, as our author has given it on p. 232.

327, 27. promovere] If this is the right reading, it must be taken in a neuter sense,—*advance*, as the present Editor has rendered it in the text of Courayer (p. 235, 11), and as Terence has used it, Eun. V. 3. 4. It cannot however be reasonably doubted that the right reading is *promoveri*, *be promoted*.

335, § v, l. 4. For “[at” read “[† at”.

335, § v, l. 5. We whose names &c.] This Certificate is translated from the French, in which alone it appears in our author's Work.

336, 17—21. These two paragraphs should evidently be reduced into one, (of four lines,) and the full stop after *Cantuariensis* changed into a semicolon. Lines 17, 18, 19 should be continued to the margin, and 18, 19, 20 begin a little farther to the right.—In Mr. Williams's Editions the two paragraphs are reduced into one, but altered and abridged as follows:—“D. Wilkins, S.T.P., Rev. in Christo Patri “Guil. Archiep. Cant. a Sacris Dom.”—“D.D.”, it may be as well to add, stands for “Domino Domino (*Lord Lord*)”, a sort of Hebrew superlative applied to Bishops.

336, Art. VII, title. Attestations against the fable &c.] Rather, “Attestations “against the statement that Dr. Morton, Bishop of Durham had asserted in Parliament a modified version of the Nag's-head story.”

338, § II. The Bps who signed this Certificate were, as we learn from Bramhall, all the then surviving ones except the Bp of Bangor, “whose absence in Wales”, says he, “is the only reason why he is not a subscriber with the rest.” p. 433.

339, Art. VIII, l. 6. a learned English Bishop] Archbishop Wake. For further particulars see p. xvii (with note c) of the Editor's Introduction: also p. lxxxv of the Epitome.

340 c c. This note should have been within brackets.

340, § III, and 341. § IV.] In both lists, both that at p. 564 and that at p. 737, before “*Episcopo Meneven*.” “T.” is put by mistake for “W.”

346, aa. To this note add, “with the Editor's note”.

349 B 1—11. This suspicion as applicable to the case in question, will be negatived by an inspection of the Register itself, unless indeed we are to suppose that the old documents were destroyed and new ones written, for which no adequate cause can be assigned.

350 C (*Quod ad* &c.). A little more space should have been left before this paragraph.

352 p. After the word *celebrate*] Not after the word *celebrate*, but after the word *London*. in the preceding line.

Ibid. Read,—[*Electo*],—and for this reason it is that it ought—p. cxxxiv. 354 B 6, 354 C 12, and 362 D 6. See p. 340 d.

354 x. On p. 268, 9 Henry VIII grants to Cardinal Wolsey the custody of the temporalities of the Bishopric of Winchester, of which Bishopric in p. 287, 8 the Pope grants him the perpetual guardianship both in spirituals and temporal. On p. 387, 8 Henry VIII grants to John Stokesley Bishop Elect of London the custody of the temporalities of that See; and at the places inserted within brackets similar grants are made,—to Cuthbert (Tonstal) Bp of London of the temporalities of the See of Durham to which he had been elected and translated, to Rowland Lee of those of Lichfield and Coventry, and to Thomas Goodricke of those of Ely. It must be observed, however, that on pages 457—9 and 785 similar grants are made to Cranmer of Canterbury and Day of Chester, when already Bishops,—in the case of Cranmer indeed three days after the date of the Order for the restitution of the temporalities of his Archbishopric;—as also on p. 780, 1 to Hethe (Bp of Rochester), with an Indemnity for having already entered into possession;—so that these grants appear to have been regarded as necessary for Bishops themselves, if not already received.

356 c. “Chap. XIII § 3” does not relate to the subject. In Chap. XII § 3. (p. 74) we have a list of fifteen Bishops who both were present at the Convocation of 1543, and also present and consenting to the Articles of 1552, but Barlow is *not* of the number there given.

361 E 10 *insinatum fuit*] Was registered, proved.

361 end and 362 beg. Compare 133 end and 134 beg.

362 C 1. *Verba Brookii &c.*] The author of this Letter appears to have transcribed the following passage not from the *Ascuns &c.* but from the Grand Abridgement itself, which the present Editor has unfortunately been unable to see. This will account for some *slight* differences of reading noticed at the foot of the pages.

362 C 2. *tiels*] Or *tielz* as in Courayer, where however it is spelt *tiels* in the following line.

362 C 3. With *lier* (if we so read) we must understand *dicitur* from the beginning of the passage.—Concerning *tiels* see the preceding note.

362 C 5 with note d. Instead of *Nota diversitie* we have in the *Ascuns &c.* the following side-title: “*Lease per Evesque nient sacre, et per Evesque deprive : diversitie*.” And as the *Ascuns &c.* is not arranged in subjects like the Grand Abridgement, the date is of course not added to each Case, but placed at the beginning of the year, or reign, and in the running title; while at the end of each Case stands the title of the subject from which it is taken, which in the Grand Abridgement is of course at the head of each subject itself. Hence the words “B. Leases 68.” (see p. 132, 5), i. e. “Brooke, Leases, Case 68.”

363 C 1. *Judicesque &c.*] This as expressed may appear to some to impute

° There is also the side-title “*Confirmation*.” opposite the word “*confirme*”.

° The 2d year of Mary beginning on the 2d line of the back of leaf 98 (Case 451), the printer has rather awkwardly made the running title to supersede the proper title of the year, notwithstanding the inter-

vening line. Case 463 however falling on the first page of leaf 101, the words “*Anno secundo Mariæ*.” have been six times printed distinctly before we arrive at it. The year ends on the next page, the running title of which is the same with that in the middle, “*Anno tertio Mariæ*.”

partiality to the Judges; but what is really meant is only that when it was apprehended that the decision of the Judges, whose business was merely with the legal aspect of the question, would probably be adverse to Ridley's friends, they applied to the Court of Chancery, which as a Court of Equity, was not so strictly limited.

364, 1. Omit *saltem*: see p. lxxxviii at the end of the Epitome.

MR. WILLIAMS'S APPENDIX.

368 F, 3. s' il est permis de l' adopter, &c.] Whether it is open to the Church to adopt it for the future.

MR. WILLIAMS'S INDEX.

The Notes to Mr. Williams's Index will be found at the foot of the page.

ADDENDA TO THE PRECEDING NOTES,

BEING CHIEFLY, WHAT MANY OF THE PRECEDING NOTES THEMSELVES ARE ALSO,
THE TRANSLATIONS OF QUOTATIONS NOT ALREADY TRANSLATED:

SEE P. XII OF THE EDITOR'S INTRODUCTION.

17 B 7. Bishop of Paris] Paris was still under Sens when this Dedication was written, though not when it was printed; having in the mean time been made an Archbishopric, and this same Henri de Gondi the first Archbishop, by Gregory XV in 1622.

18 B. margin. Dissert. MSS.] Read perhaps "Dissert. MS.", i. e. "MS. "Dissertation", i. e. the autograph of Renaudot, which perhaps contained more than what was printed. Compare p. xxvi of the Editor's Introduction, in connection with which it may be observed that the contents and character of the present Work were no doubt pretty extensively known before it was actually published.

19 B 14. After "*Epistola*." add: ["A Letter to a Friend concerning the true and uninterrupted Succession of the English Bishops down to our own times."]

42 m, last line. After *De Vocatione Ministrorum* add, ["On the Calling of "Ministers"],

45 D 3—4. *Sub—invaserat*.] Add, ["without any Consecration had invaded "the Episcopate under Edward VI."]

45 D 8. After *Anglicanæ* add, ["Annals of the Anglican Church"].

51, 1—3. *Quatenus—effectu*.] Add, ["That you, or at the least four of your "number,—the same Master Matthew Parker as Archbishop and Pastor of the "aforesaid Church to consecrate—be pleased with effect."]

53, 7—9. *Nec—poteris*.] Add, ["Nor will you ever be able to shew the "accustomed vocation or Consecration."].

63 B 8—14. *Confirmati—Parliamento*.] Add, ["When confirmed they are "consecrated; and when after their Consecration they have taken the oath of "homage to the King, and the King in return has restored them the possessions of "their Bishopries . . . they enjoy these honours. They have the title of Lords "in virtue of the Baronies annexed to their Bishopries, and precedence before "the other Barons of the Kingdom, not only in private assemblies, but in the "Supreme Council of the Kingdom, the Parliament"].

67, 16—18. *Per—ibidem.*] Add, ["by the free and spontaneous resignation into our hands of the last Bishop of that See."]

68, 4. After *ibidem* add, ["by the free resignation of the last Bishop of that See"].

68, 9. After *Bourne.* add, ["The See of Bath and Wells became vacant by the resignation of William Barlow a married man, to whom succeeded Gilbert Bourne."]

70, 2. After *Episcopus* add, ["the last Bishop of that See"].

71 B 6—9. *Regina,—velitis.*] Add, ["the Queen, &c. . . . desiring . . . and commanding that the same Master William Barlow as Bishop and Pastor of the aforesaid Church to consecrate, and all and singular the other things to perform . . . you be pleased."].

71 C 14. After *consecrare* add, [to consecrate.]

72 D 4. To the last foot-note under the note to this line add:—The Rev. William Cole, Fellow of King's College, Cambridge, in his acute and entertaining MS. annotations to Strype's Memorials of Cranmer, found in a copy of that Work preserved in the Bodleian Library (K. 5, 13, Art.)^q, refers for a correction by Dr. Brett of Wharton's error about this title to vol. 3 of his own A. C. (*Athenæ Cantabrigienses*, unpublished, in the British Museum) M. p. 527, 528.

73 3. *peragere &c.*] Add, ["Firmly enjoining you that the aforesaid John Capon of Sarum elect and the aforesaid election to confirm, and the same John Capon as Bishop of Sarum to consecrate, and the rest to perform &c."]

73 B 9. *velitis.*] Add, ["Wherefore we enjoin you that all the other things which by you for the Confirmation and Consecration of the same person in the said Bishopric have been accustomed to be done you be pleased to do."]

73 C 6. *Consecrationem.*] Add, ["For the Confirmation and Consecration."]

73 D 7. *velitis.*] Add, ["That the aforesaid Elect to invest and consecrate . . . you be pleased."]

73 E 7. *consecrare.*] Add, ["The aforesaid election to confirm, and the same person as Archbishop and Pastor of the aforesaid Church to invest and consecrate."]

74, 3. *consecrare.*] Add, ["And the same Hugh as Bishop and Pastor of the aforesaid See to consecrate."]

74, 8. *consecrare.*] Add, ["The same Richard as Bishop and Pastor of the aforesaid Church of Chester to consecrate."]

74 C 5. *consecrare.*] Add, ["To Confirm and . . . consecrate."]

74 D 2. After *consecrare* add, ["to consecrate"].

74 C 9. *velitis.*] Add, ["Enjoining you that . . . the same Election to confirm, and the same person as Bishop and Pastor of the aforesaid Church to authorize and invest, and all and singular the other things to perform . . . you be pleased."]

75, 5. and 75 B 6. *investire.*] Add, ["to authorize and invest."]

75 C 7. *perimplere &c.*] Add, ["The aforesaid election to confirm, and all and singular the other things to perform and fulfil &c."]

75 D 8. *facere &c.*] Add, ["The aforesaid election to confirm, and the same person . . . as Bishop and Pastor of the aforesaid Church to institute, and all and singular the other things to do &c."]

^q There is also a MS. Index of his at the end, finished A.D. 1775.

77, 10—14. *Rogantes—velitis.*] Add, [“Desiring and — commanding, that the same Master William Barlow, of the said Cathedral Church of Chichester Bishop and Pastor Elect (as is aforesaid), and the said Election, you confirm, and all other things perform —.”]

80, 3. After *Electi* add [“the last Bishop Elect of that See”].

80, 6. After *Electi* add [“Bishop Elect of that See”].

81, 19—23. *Cum—&c.*] Add, [“Whereas the Episcopal See of Hereford, as well by the natural death of Francis Godwin late Bishop thereof, as by the motion of the Rev. Father in Christ William Juxon Bishop Elect of the same to the Bishopric of London, has lately become vacant, &c.”]

82; 1, 2. After *Episcopus Assavensis* add, [Bishop of St. Asaph]; after *Electus*, [Elect].

82 B; 12, 13. After *Electi et Confirmati* add [Elect and Confirmed]; after *Consecrati* [Consecrated].

88 B 18. After “*subjiciuntur*” add, [“are subject to the Archbishop alone”].

90 B 6. After *addictissimus* add, [“greatly attached to the Popish doctrine”].

104 B 5, &c.] *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum*] add, [“Receive the Holy Ghost”].

104 B 10. *Veni Creator*] *Veni Creator Spiritus* [“Creating Spirit come”] &c.: see p. 312, 313.

113; 19, 20. *ad—spectant*] add, [“regard only the solemnity of the Sacrament, and the fuller expression of its meaning”].

128, 32. restored] Read “restored to their former footing”.

133 B. In the second side-note for “deception” read “anachronism”.

133 B 17. After *Regina* add, [“The Judges of the Kingdom under Queen Elizabeth herself”].

133 B 24. After *Mariæ* add [“In the second year of Mary”].

133 B 26. After *&c.* add, [“Some Novel Cases of the years and times of the King Henry VIII, Edward VI, and the Queen Mary, &c.”].

133 l. ult.—134, 3. *Ascuns—ans.*] add, [“Some Novel Cases of the years and times of the King Henry VIII, Edward VI, and the Queen Mary; written out from the Grand Abridgment, composed by Sir Robert Brooke, Knight; there dispersed under the titles, but here collected under the years.”]

136, 14. Remove the comma after “premisses”, and place it after “power”.

137, 22. *Supplentes &c.*] Add as a foot-note:—[Translated, p. 136.]

139, 23. After “*desit.*” add: [“Whatever — or in you, or any of you, your condition, state, or power, for the performance of the premisses may be wanting.”]

142, 14. several questions] The 3d, 4th, 5th, 6th, and 7th.

142, 15. they always exclude] To the 3d, 5th, and 6th questions their answer was the denial of a determinate number at all. With respect to the fourth and seventh see the notes to p. 142, 17 and 144 B 6.

142, 17. they extend] Rather “Cranmer extends”. Barlow says that four only, viz. Baptism, the Sacrament of the Altar, Matrimony, and Penance, are most chiefly spoken of in the old Doctors. Compare the notes to p. 142, 15, and 144 B 6.

144 B 1. the seventh question] See the note to p. 142, 20.

144 B 3—6. *Conveniunt—Carliolens.*] Add, [“They agree except the Bp of St. David’s that the nature of the seven Sacraments is given us in the Scriptures.”]

“The Abp of York enumerates their several effects: so also the Bp of Carlisle.”]; together with the following note:

144 B 6. except the Bp of St. David’s] He (Barlow) allowed it only of Baptism, the Sacrament of the Altar, Matrimony, and Penance. Cranmer mentions the same Sacraments, objecting however to the common mode of treating Penance. Of Matrimony he says he finds “very much in Scripture”, and accordingly he enlarges most upon it.

144 B; 10, 11. *Omnes—Episcopos*] Add, [“All agree that the Apostles received of God the power of making Bishops”].

144 B; 20, 21. *Convenit—Presbyteros*] Add, [“All except the Bp of St. David’s agree that Bishops have the power of appointing Priests”].

144 B 22—27. *Eboracen,—Edgeworth.*] Add (before the bracket), “The Abp of York appears entirely to deny this authority to others. Redmayn, Symmons, Robertson, Leighton, Thirleby, Curren, the Bp of Rochester, Edgeworth, Oglethorp, and the Bp of Carlisle, have nowhere read that others have used this power; [although (by a certain privilege) it was given to Moses, as Redman and Edgeworth think.]”

145, 1—9. *Respondent—&c.*] Add, [“The Abp of York, the Bps of London and Carlisle, Leighton, Tresham, Robertson, Edgeworth, Curren, Day, and Oglethorp, reply that Consecration is required. Redman says that it was received from the Apostles, and instituted by the Holy Ghost for conferring grace. Day, the Bp of Rochester, and Symmons, say that the Priesthood is conferred by the imposition of hands, and that from the Scriptures, but that Consecration has long been received in the Church; Cox that appointment with imposition of hands is sufficient, and that Consecration is not required by the Scripture. &c.”]

145, 16—19. *Fatentur—&c.*] Add, [“All allow, as before, that Laymen may teach. The Abp of York, Symmons, and Oglethorp, deny that they may ordain Presbyters; yet the Abp of York allows that they may baptize and perform marriages; Edgeworth only that they may baptize, for this he says is sufficient for salvation. &c.”]

156 B 4. *Deus—est,*] Add, [“God Who for our sakes was made man,”].

162 m, col. 1, l. 10. After “sensibilia,” Morinus proceeds, “quæ sufficienter significarent collationem potestatis traditæ in qualibet Ordinatione;” (*which should sufficiently signify the conferring of the power given in any Ordination*);

Ibid. col. 2, l. 3, 4. After “superior;” Morinus proceeds, “materia verò et forma aliorum Sacramentorum est physica, quam per consequens fixam et immutabilem remanere congruit.”: (*but the matter of the other Sacraments is physical, which consequently it is congruous should remain fixed and immutable.*)

163, 6 and 9. See the notes to 162 m.

165, 10. “But &c.”] The preceding words of Gregory are: “Novit fraternitas tua Romanæ Ecclesiæ consuetudinem, in qua se meminit enutritam.” (*You know, Brother, the custom of the Church of Rome, in which you remember yourself to have been brought up.*)

168 C 6. in particular Pastors] “per quemcunque Ecclesiarum Pastorem”.

171 B 3. Read, If he added to the form these words, . . . not &c. The word *formæ* (see note *f*) was omitted by our author.

THE AUTHOR'S MS. ADDITIONS ETC.
FOR THE DEFENCE AND SUPPLEMENT.

MS. ADDITIONS ETC. FOR THE DEFENCE OF THE PRESENT WORK,^a

FOUND IN THE AUTHOR'S HANDWRITING^b IN HIS OWN COPY OF THE DEFENCE,
PRESERVED IN ARCHBISHOP TENNISON'S LIBRARY: SEE PP. IX
AND LXV OF THE PRESENT EDITOR'S INTRODUCTION.

In vol. 1, part 2, p. 363, l. 5, (in the English Translation, vol. 1, p. 500, l. 17,) *sans* (without) is corrected in the margin to *sur* (upon). This correction, however, appears to be a mistake itself.

In vol. 2, part 2, after the words "Observations Importantes, &c." (*Important Observations, &c.*), which conclude the title of Art. 22 (p. clxii,—in the Eng. Trans. vol. 2, p. 562) of the Proofs, is added:—"par Mr. de Paris, alors Coadjuteur et maintenant Evêque "d' Orleans." (by Mr. de Paris, then Coadjutor and now Bishop of Orleans.)

In the last paragraph of the same Article, opposite the words "l'Ecrivain le plus vrai, le plus modéré, et le plus judicieux, qu' ait produit depuis long-temps l'Eglise Gallicane" (p. ccxii: in the Eng. Trans.^c, p. 574), *the truest, the most moderate, and the most judicious writer whom the Gallican Church has produced for a long time,*—is written in the margin "L'Abbé Fleury."

Besides which, on a blank leaf at the end of vol. 1. part 2, there is waxed a loose paper containing the two following additions:

[1.] "Epitaphe de la femme de Scory à [Epitaph of the wife of Scory at] St. Leonard's "Shoreditch.

"Here lyeth buried Elizabeth Skory y^e wife of y^e late Rev^d Father in God John Skory "late Bishop of Hereford. The said R^d Father in y^e reign of King Edward y^e sixth was "Bishop of Rochester, and translated from thence to Chichester. He departed this life at "Whitborne in y^e County of Hereford y^e 26th day of June anno Dom. 1585, and y^e said "Elizabeth deceased in Holywell in this Parish y^e 8th day of March 1592.

"Maitland's Hist. of Lond. L. [Book] 8, p. 869.

"Cette Epitaphe est une nouvelle preuve des différent Episcopats de Scory. [This "Epitaph is a fresh proof of the different Bishoprics of Scory.]

"Addit. pour la Défense, L. 3 [Addition for the Defence, Book 3], Ch. xi, p. 383. [In "the Eng. Trans., vol. 1, p. 513.]"

[This Epitaph, however, is not among the Epitaphs given in the account of St. Leonard's Shoreditch in the 8th Book of Entick's Edition of Maitland's History of London, in two volumes, A.D. 1775; nor has the present Editor been able, after spending much time in the attempt, to light upon it elsewhere in that Work. The previous Editions of 1739 in one,

^a The Additional Errata for the Original of the present Work, which it had been intended (see p. lxxv of the Editor's Introduction) to insert here, it has been found necessary, for want of room, to transfer to the end of the Epitome, pp. lxxxvii, lxxxviii. Instead therefore of "this volume,—its PS.", on p. lxxv of the Introduction, read, "the Epitome of the whole volume."

^b In the same with the note (dated and signed with his name) at the bottom of the next page.

^c From which however the present Editor does not profess to quote, having translated or corrected for himself all the foreign quotations which occur in this volume.

and 1756 and 1760 in two, volumes, which are mentioned by Lowndes, and of which that of 1739 is most probably the one referred to by our author, the present Editor has been unable to see.]

[2.] “Autre preuve pour l'Episcopat de Barlow, tirée du Registre du Conseil du temps de la Reine Marie [Another proof for the Episcopate of Barlow, drawn from the Register of the Council of the time of Queen Mary]:

“22d of April 1554. This day one William Marriner of Bristoll for conveying of Dr. Barlow late Bishop of Bath over the Sea was committed to the Marshalsea.

“Addition pour la Défense, Liv. 3 [Addition for the Defence, Book 3], Chap. VII pag. 258. [In the Eng. Trans., vol. 1, p. 433.]”

THREE CORRECTIONS AND A NOTE

FOR THE SUPPLEMENT TO THE PRESENT WORK AND ITS DEFENCE,

FOUND IN THE SAME HANDWRITING IN THE AUTHOR'S OWN COPY OF THE SUPPLEMENT, PRESERVED IN ARCHBISHOP TENNISON'S LIBRARY: SEE PP. IX AND LXV OF THE PRESENT EDITOR'S INTRODUCTION.

I. *Three MS. corrections, of which the first is found both in the margin and in the Errata, the second in the margin, and the third in the Errata, alone.*

“ (1.) P. 293, l. 27, *achevée, je crois*] Read, *achevée, soit mal fondée, je crois.*

“ (2.) P. 502, l. 15, *Censures*] Read, *Censeurs.*


“ (3.) P. 590, l. 12, *l'Evêque de Seglia*] Read, —*de Veglia.*”

II. *A MS. note added to the Errata, and referred to in the margin by the words “V. l' Errata.” [See the Errata.]*

“ P. 346, l. 15, *un Mémoire justificatif de Cranmer* [a Mémoire in justification of Cranmer]. J' ai consulté depuis le Mémoire dont il est ici question, et il ne s' y agit ni de Cranmer ni de Barlow : ainsi on n' en peut tirer aucune preuve ni pour ni contre la Consécration de Barlow. [I have since consulted the Mémoire in question, and neither Cranmer nor Barlow is there spoken of: no proof therefore can be drawn thence either for or against the Consecration of Barlow.]

“ Ce 14. Decembre [This 14th of Dec.] 1737.

P. Fr. Le-Courayer.”





NOV 17 1983

**PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE
CARDS OR SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET**

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY

UTL AT DOWNSVIEW



D RANGE BAY SHLF POS ITEM C
39 16 16 22 01 015 0